DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 480 HE 020 622

AUTHOR Sallee, Joan S.
TITLE Segmental Actions Regarding Remedial Education. A Progress Report. Staff Report Series. Commission Report 86-39.
INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 28 Apr 86
NOTE 111p.
AVAILABLE FROM California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 12th Street, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *College Preparation; *College School Cooperation; *Community Colleges; Credit Courses; Educationally Disadvantaged; Government School Relationship; High Risk Students; Postsecondary Education; Program Evaluation; Public Colleges; *Remedial Instruction; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS California Community Colleges; *California State University; *University of California

ABSTRACT

The progress of the California community colleges, the California State University (CSU), and the University of California in providing remedial courses and services to underprepared students is reported. Attention is directed to progress in implementing 17 recommendations made by the California Postsecondary Education Commission in the 1983 report, "Promises to Keep, Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities." Three of the recommendations relate to the issue of awarding academic credit for remedial work, while five recommendations deal with needed studies, evaluation, and reports. Four of the recommendations were directed to the University of California and CSU, and five dealt with the community colleges. Three reports are appended: (1) "Progress Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on Implementing Recommendations from 'Promises to Keep'" (University of California, February 1, 1986); (2) "Implementation of the CSU Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity, 1985-1990: A Progress Report," (January 1986); and (3) "Biennial Report of the California Community Colleges in Response to Recommendations from 'Promises to Keep,'" (February 1986). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Summary

This report by Joan S. Sallee of the Commission staff describes the progress of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California through March 1986 in implementing the recommendations of the Commission in its January 1983 report, *Promises To Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities*. Appendices to the report reproduce materials submitted to the Commission by the systemwide offices of the three segments regarding their remediation activities.

The staff issued two earlier reports on the segments' responses -- *Progress Report on Segmental Responses to the Commission's Recommendations Regarding Remedial Education* (Report 84-26) in July 1984, and *Segmental Actions Regarding Remedial Education* (Report 86-39) in April 1986.

The Policy Evaluation Committee of the Commission discussed this report at its April 28, 1986 meeting. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Publications Office of the Commission. Further information about the report may be obtained from Ms. Sallee at (916) 322-8011.

SEGMENTAL ACTIONS REGARDING REMEDIAL EDUCATION

A Progress Report

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Second Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814

COMMISSION REPORT 86-39
PUBLISHED APRIL 1986

THIS is one in a series of staff reports on important issues affecting California postsecondary education. These reports are brought to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for discussion rather than for action, and they represent the interpretation of the staff rather than the formal position of the Commission as expressed in its adopted resolutions and reports containing policy recommendations.

Like other publications of the Commission, this report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 86-39 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Introduction 1

Recommendation 1 3

Recommendation 2 7

Recommendation 3 11

Recommendation 4 13

Recommendations 5 and 6 19

Recommendations 7 and 8 21

Recommendation 9 23

Recommendation 10 25

Recommendations 11 and 12 27

Recommendation 13 29

Recommendation 14 31

Recommendation 15 33

Recommendation 16 35

Recommendation 17 37

Appendix A: University of California Materials 39

Appendix B: California State University Materials 81

Appendix C: California Community College Materials 107

References 117

Introduction

In January 1983, the California Postsecondary Education Commission issued its report on remediation, *Promises To Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities*. In the final chapter of that report, the Commission set forth 17 recommendations regarding the provision of remedial courses and services to underprepared students in the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. The last of those recommendations requested that the segments report to the Commission biennially, beginning in December 1985, on their progress on each of the applicable recommendations.

The first four of the recommendations were directed at the University of California and the California State University:

- Recommendation 1 concerns the reduction of remedial activities in four-year institutions over a five-year period.
- Recommendation 2 deals with improved coordination and integration of those remedial activities which must be provided.
- Recommendation 3 relates to the exploration of cooperative arrangements with the Community Colleges and K-12 adult schools in the provision of remedial activities.
- Recommendation 4 involves work with the high schools and the monitoring of students' preparation as they enter college.

The next five recommendations deal with the Community Colleges:

- Recommendation 5 asserts the role of the Community Colleges as the primary postsecondary provider of remedial courses and services.
- Recommendation 6 concerns the establishment of an academic floor and redirection of students to adult basic education programs.
- Recommendation 7 directs that all Community College districts develop comprehensive assessment/placement, advising, and follow-up programs for remedial students.
- Recommendation 8 deals with the need to establish delineation of function agreements between Community Colleges and feeder high schools/districts.
- Recommendation 9 refers to building partnerships with the high schools. Such efforts would include defining standards for college preparatory work and reporting data to the high schools about their students' performance in college and preparation based upon scores on entry-level diagnostic tests.

The next three recommendations relate to the issue of awarding academic credit for remedial work:

- Recommendation 10 deals with the removal of baccalaureate degree credit from remedial coursework at the University and the State University.
- Recommendation 11 suggests that remedial coursework also not be accepted for transfer credit.
- Recommendation 12 directs that associate degree credit not be awarded to remedial courses.

The final five recommendations deal with needed studies, evaluation, and reports:

- Recommendation 13 concerns the need for a study of English as a Second Language courses and services by all three segments of higher education, together with the State Department of Education.
- Recommendation 14 proposes the development of a set of alternative models for assessment/placement in the Community Colleges.
- Recommendation 15 relates to the segments' providing diagnostic testing in the high schools as an early warning system about students' skill levels.
- Recommendation 16 directs that each segment develop rigorous program evaluation for its remedial courses and services.

- Recommendation 17 establishes biennial reports from the segments regarding their progress on each of the aforementioned recommendations.

At the Commission's request, Commission staff prepared two interim progress reports on the segments' progress -- the first in July 1984, and the second in December 1985. In the more recent of those reports, the staff briefly summarized the major activities of the segments since 1984 but cautioned that more complete documentation and review would have to wait for the reports from the segments themselves.

The last of these reports has recently arrived and forms the basis for the following analysis, which includes both a description of the segments' progress on each recommendation and an identification of those areas demanding further inquiry and action.

Readers interested in more than the overview that follows are referred to Appendix A on pages 39-79 for the University of California's progress report, Appendix B on pages 81-107 for the California State University's report, and Appendix C on pages 107-115 for the California Community Colleges' report.

Recommendation 1

"That the University of California and the California State University each develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a plan whose goal is to reduce remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language within a five-year period to a level consonant with the principles of both quality and access as determined by each segment. In developing such plans, the segments should take into account the anticipated effects of increased admissions requirements and the steps taken by the high schools to improve student preparation. These plans shall be transmitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for review and comment."

University of California

The University of California submitted its response to this recommendation in February 1984, after nine months' work by a University-wide Committee on Remediation. The University's plan was reviewed in the July 1984 staff progress report to the Commission, which noted that the University was focusing on improving preparation at the high school level rather than on reducing its own remedial activities as requested in the recommendation.

The University has indeed greatly expanded its activities with the high schools, as shall be described under Recommendation 4 below, and it has diligently pursued the course it has laid out for itself. But the University has not met the intent of the Commission's first recommendation, and there continues to be some misunderstanding about the Commission's intention to reduce, rather than eliminate, remedial education in the University and State University.

For example, in a February 1986 report, the University's Work Group on Student Preparation and Remedial Education states (p.1):

> CPEC and some members of the Legislature have taken the position that remedial instruction should be defined specifically within each segment and, in the four-year segments, should be viewed as a short-term measure to be eliminated from the curriculum as soon as is practical.

It is unfortunate that this point of view persists, despite the Commission's clear statement to the contrary, as illustrated by these sentences in *Promises To Keep* (p. 102):

> . . . if institutions maintain their commitment to access, both to the educationally disadvantaged and to those wishing to reenter higher education after some appreciable interval, the need for remedial courses and services at the University of California and the California State University will continue in some measure and will never entirely disappear unless society reaches utopic levels. As pointed out in an earlier section to this report, history indicates that remediation is not a temporary phenomenon but a permanent one.

The California State University

In 1983, the California State University constituted a systemwide task force that submitted the State University's plan to the Commission in January 1985, after an extensive 16-month consultation process. The plan proposed to:

1. Increase the State University's collaboration with the high schools to improve students' basic skills before they enter college;

2. Explore the possibility of establishing remedial programs between the State University and either the Community Colleges or the Adult Schools; and

3. Establish goals for the reduction of remedial activity in the State University system.

By 1990, the State University expects to reduce the need for remediation by all regularly admitted first-time freshmen to 12 percent in English and 8 percent in mathematics, as defined by successful passage by these students of the English Placement Test and Entry-Level Mathematics Examination.

In the 1984-85 testing year of May 1984 through January 1985, the State University approached or surpassed its goals for that year: 49 percent of the target group demonstrated competency on the English test, compared to a goal of 48 percent, and 56 percent passed the mathematics test, against a goal of 58 percent. In 1985-86, using the same goals established for the prior year, 48 percent of those tested passed the English test, while another 56 percent passed the mathematics test.

The State University has instituted an Intensive Learning Experience program on 17 campuses to accomplish these goals without undue adverse effect on minority students, returning adults, students admitted under special action, and others needing remedial assistance. This program, together with the Summer Bridge Program, allows underprepared students access to a system that esteems quality by remedying their skill deficiencies, thus enabling them to achieve their educational goals.

Meeting the State University's goals for regularly admitted first-time freshmen in the future, however, may be complicated by the State University's recent change in its admission eligibility criteria. In 1985, the State University revised downward the SAT and ACT scores and the grade-point averages necessary for admission, in order to assure regular admission to the top one-third of all California high school graduates each year, as stipulated in the State's Master Plan for Higher Education, rather than the 29 percent of graduates then currently eligible. Many of these additional students may not have the necessary skills to undertake college-level courses and will likely need remedial work -- thus making the State University's goals difficult to achieve as scheduled.

It is also not known what effect the State University's new admission requirements and its "conditional admissions" category will have on its remediation reduction plan. Thus while the Commission commends the State University for its efforts to reduce remediation on its own campuses, as well as to lessen the need for remediation by working with high schools, it is concerned that achieving a prepared student population by 1990 may be too ambitious a task.

The State University has also implemented or proposed a number of other initiatives that are designed to improve student preparation and therefore indirectly reduce the need for remediation. Although these initiatives were discussed in the Commission staff's December 1985 progress report, additional work which has occurred in the interim is noted throughout the following list:

1. Increased admissions requirements

The Commission staff has raised a number of questions with the State University about the implementation of its new admissions requirements.

2. Joint review of college preparatory coursework

The University of California's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has declined to join the State University in a review of the lists of courses that high schools regularly submit to the University as college preparatory courses.* The State University also uses these lists and had proposed that joint faculty committees review the content of these courses, beginning with all English courses. Since the lists are sent to the University, the State University cannot itself initiate such a review.

In lieu, therefore, the State University has issued "definition and designation" statements for college preparatory mathematics and English courses so that high schools can examine their curricula and compare their courses to the course criteria set out by the State University.

The Commission believes that the content of college preparatory courses offered by the high schools may not always meet the expectations of an A-to-F pattern course, regardless of course title, and that an in-

---

* BOARS prefers to handle the matter through its work with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, which is looking at the way college preparatory programs are evaluated during the high school accreditation process.

tersegmental examination of these courses would be most beneficial.

3. Diagnostic testing in the high schools

This initiative is discussed under Recommendation 15 on pages 33-34.

4. Testing of basic skills as a condition of admission

This idea has for the moment been set aside while the State University focuses its efforts on diagnostic testing in the high schools.

5. Expansion of the academic performance reports sent to high schools and Community Colleges

A December 1985 agenda item contains Commission recommendations about continuance and expansion of this work.

6. Development of junior and senior high school curricular frameworks and text selection for college preparatory courses

Although several projects undertaken by the State University relate to this initiative, there is no specific project in place to effect it.

7. Increased opportunities for secondary school faculty to improve their understanding of and ability to teach college preparatory courses beginning in Fall 1986

No program is yet in place to effect this initiative.

8. Increased teacher education admission requirements and improvement in teacher preparation programs

In May 1985, the State University's Trustees approved minimum entry and exit requirements for its teacher education programs. In addition, the campuses have implemented a $4.4 million program to improve the clinical supervision of its student teachers, and the Office of the Chancellor has recently received a report regarding the training of teachers in mathematics and sciences that was prepared by a systemwide task force of faculty and administrators. The Commission believes that the State University should continue and expand its efforts to improve its teacher education programs.

Recommendation 2

"That the University of California and the California State University in the interim continue to offer or make available remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language to the degree dictated by the needs of incoming students as determined by appropriate assessment. In the interest of better coordination and integration, each segment should examine the means by which its campuses offer remediation in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, in order to ensure maximum quality, responsiveness to student need, lowest cost, and least duplication."

University of California

The University of California recently conducted a study of the status of remediation on its campuses, collecting information on (1) all remedial courses offered by the University, (2) 1984-85 enrollments in these courses, (3) cooperative arrangements made by campuses to have remedial courses taught by the Community Colleges, (4) the diagnostic tests used by the campuses, and (5) the evaluation models used to assess remedial courses. In addition, it gathered qualitative judgments about student preparation and remedial instruction through interviews with approximately 150 faculty and administrators on the eight general campuses.

Display 1 on page 8, taken directly from the University's report to the Commission, shows 1983-84 and 1984-85 enrollments in courses designed to meet the Subject A requirement, and Display 2 on page 9, again reproduced from the University's report, shows enrollments in all remedial mathematics courses for the same years.

In comparing these data and others provided by the University to the last year of data in *Promises To Keep*, and taking into account certain definitional and reporting inconsistencies, it appears that enrollments in remedial English have remained steady and those in remedial mathematics have increased somewhat. Such a conclusion must remain tentative at best, however, because of the ambiguities among the various data sources.

Faculty members and administrators interviewed for the University's study expressed a wide range of opinion on student preparation. In general, they agreed that the precipitous decline in skills, which had become so apparent in the 1970s through SAT scores and other measures, has been halted. Although the situation appears to have stabilized, however, nothing as yet points to a upward swing, since students still have difficulty with analysis, reading, writing, conceptualization, interpretation, and synthesis -- the same kinds of problems cited during similar interviews five years ago. Yet a third of the faculty members and administrators interviewed think today's students are better prepared than those who entered the University in 1980, while half the respondents said there was no difference.

There may be no need for the University to replicate such a study in the future. Beginning in September 1986, the University will be able to monitor the level of students' preparation upon entry as well as their performance, persistence, and graduation through its Student Longitudinal System. A user's group is now developing recommendations about the elements that need to be added to the University's existing Corporate Data Base to implement this system that is scheduled to be in effect for at least five years and that will allow for continual appraisal of students' preparation, both upon entry and throughout their college careers.

The University is also continuing to examine its remedial activities through the work of the Universi-

DISPLAY 1 Students Taking Pre-Subject A, Subject A, Writing Courses with a Remedial Component at the University of California in 1983-84 and 1984-85

UC Campus Course Titles	Enrollments		Degree Credit		Workload Credit	
	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85
Berkeley						
Subject A1, Introduction to Language	1,247	1,168	2	2	2	2
Subject A1-C, Introduction to Language (cont.)		42		2		0
Asian American Studies		51		2		2
Davis						
English A, Language Skills	1,269	1,569	2	0	2	4
English R, Communication Skills Workshop	34	60	2	0	2	4
Irvine						
Writing 39A	1,365	1,415	4	2	0	2
Writing Workshop	393	413	2	0	0	2
Los Angeles						
English 1, Fundamentals of Exposition	1,351	1,367	2	0	2	4
English A, Basic Review of English Language	86	90	0	0	4	4
Riverside						
Basic Writing 1	277	275	0	0	4	4
Basic Writing 2A, B	54	77	0	0	4	4
Qualifier Courses		100		0		0
San Diego						
None (students were not separated and placed in remedial classes until Fall 1985)						
Santa Barbara						
English 1, English Composition	2,022	1,879	2	2	2	2
Santa Cruz						
Writing 10 Subject A Tutorial		358				
Total	8,098	8,864				

Source: *Progress Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on Implementing Recommendations from* Promises To Keep, *February 1, 1986*. Berkeley: Office of the President, University of California, p. 4a.

DISPLAY 2 *Students Taking Pre-Calculus Mathematics Courses at the University of California in 1983-84 and 1984-85*

UC Campus	Course Titles	Enrollments		Degree Credit		Workload Credit	
		1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85
Berkeley							
Math P	Algebra Trigonometry	614	494	2	2	2	2
Math PS	Self-Paced Algebra & Trigonometry	519	556	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
Davis							
Math B	Algebra	75	67	0	0	3	3
Math C	Trigonometry	76	104	0	0	3	3
Math D	Intermediate Algebra	323	444	0	0	3	3
Math Pre-16A	Algebra & Trigonometry			0	0	3	3
Co 16A, B	Supplemental for 16A, B			0	0	1	1
Math Pre-21A	Functions, Problem Solving	369	470	0	0	3	3
Co 21A, B, C	Supplemental for 21A,B,C			0	0	1	1
Irvine							
Math 1	Algebra		1,122		0		4
Math 1A	Algebra		90		0		4
Chem 10			370		0		4
Los Angeles							
Math M	Algebra	16	15	0	0	4	4
Math 1A, B	Intermediate Algebra	1,116	477	2	0	2	4
Chem A	Problem Solving	142	Not Offered	0		4	
Riverside							
Math 3	Basic Math	117	155	0	0	4	4
San Diego							
Mesa Math 103	Intermediate Algebra		28		0		4
Mesa Math 140	College Algebra		255		0		4
Santa Barbara							
Math 1	College Algebra	494	347	4	0	0	4
Math 1S	Self-paced College Algebra	256	192	0	1-4	0	1-4
Math 1M	Computer-aided College Algebra	304	41	0	0	4	4
Santa Cruz							
Math 1A, B, C	Basic Mathematics	166	94	0	0	1	5
Total		4,587	5,291				

Source: *Progress Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on Implementing Recommendations from* Promises To Keep, *February 1, 1986*. Berkeley: Office of the President, University of California, p. 4b.

ty-wide Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education, established by the Academic Senate in 1983. This committee is responsible for establishing appropriate standards for the Subject A and mathematics placement tests, monitoring the implementation of the Senate resolution that withdrew baccalaureate degree credit for remedial work, and encouraging campuses to establish local committees along the same lines. The Committee has worked with writing program faculty to develop the University-wide Subject A examination and has established a subcommittee to examine questions related to the preparation of students whose native language is not English.

The California State University

In Fall 1985, the California State University conducted an inventory of campus activities that support its plan to reduce remediation, and it is currently maintaining a number of evaluation activities that are mentioned under Recommendation 16. Yet the State University has never published the data it compiled for its Task Force on Remediation on the ways in which remediation is provided on its campuses, nor has it undertaken any recent study, similar to the University's. It is not clear, therefore, what data the State University has and if this information is used in effecting the coordination and integration asked for in the Commission's second recommendation. To augment its numerous evaluation efforts, the State University might wish to consider a restudy of its remediation activities. Only by knowing what courses, services, enrollments, and administrative arrangements currently exist can one ensure maximum quality and responsiveness, achieve minimum cost, and avoid unnecessary duplication.

Recommendation 3

"That the University of California and the California State University explore cooperative arrangements with institutions such as Community Colleges and K-12 adult schools to provide remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language."

University of California

Five University campuses -- Berkeley, Los Angeles, Davis, Irvine, and San Diego -- have established cooperative arrangements whereby faculty from nearby Community Colleges teach some of the University's remedial courses. With one exception, however (that of San Diego), these cooperative programs are extremely limited in scope, with the campuses having decided either to hire one course out or one instructor in.

San Diego

Only UC San Diego currently has a full partnership program with a Community College. In 1983, the University arranged to have instructors from San Diego Mesa College teach all intermediate algebra and college algebra courses for its students, and in 1985 it began a similar program in remedial writing. Both faculty and administrators feel that the mathematics program is very successful -- an opinion borne out by the fact that students who take these courses do as well as other students when they take more advanced mathematics classes.

Various aspects of the program undoubtedly contribute to its success:

- Students are carefully screened through diagnostic testing;
- Class size is small (30 at the Community College compared to 200-300 at the University);
- Instructors are experienced; and
- Course syllabi are jointly designed.

The situation is different in English. After ten years of variance, based on the philosophy that *all* freshmen need some kind of writing assistance, San Diego was required in 1985 to institute the Subject A requirement and establish courses for students not meeting the requirement. To handle these new circumstances, the campus appointed a task force that agreed to have Mesa College instructors teach the courses, and it hired a Subject A Coordinator to work with Mesa's Dean of Off-Campus Programs. The University tests and places incoming students in the course which has been designed largely by the Mesa faculty. As the University notes in its progress report (p. 10), "This has not been an easy change for the campus." The program is being closely watched by faculty not only at UC San Diego but on other campuses as well.

Berkeley

For years, UC Berkeley and Vista College have struggled to resolve the problems that face campuses interested in University-Community College partnerships: finding space on the University campus for the Community College courses, paying the Community College for the additional workload because of its enrollment cap, assuring the availability of enough qualified faculty, and working out differences in pay scale. After several years of discussion and negotiation, Vista finally offered one section of remedial mathematics for Berkeley students by Vista in Fall 1985, and efforts are being made to resolve implementation difficulties and expand the initial arrangement. The Berkeley campus believes that the small class size which Vista can offer is particularly advantageous to its students.

UCLA

Since 1981, Los Angeles City College has offered Chemistry 17 for UCLA students, and UCLA has paid the instructor's salary. In January 1986, the course became a regular part of the district's curriculum and will be funded through the State's average daily attendance formula.

Other campuses

UC Irvine, along with UCLA, appoints a high school teacher as a visiting fellow to teach basic mathematics, and UC Davis hires high school and Community College instructors to teach remedial mathematics. UC Santa Barbara appoints a high school instructor as a visiting lecturer to teach sections of introductory writing, and it is considering a cooperative arrangement in mathematics for 1986-87 with Santa Barbara Community College.

The California State University

Seven California State University campuses are conducting or planning cooperative programs with Community Colleges or adult schools. Courses at Chico, Long Beach, Northridge, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo are currently being offered by area Community Colleges; Fullerton will begin such an arrangement in Fall 1986; and Bakersfield is considering working with its local adult school in the provision of remediation.

The details of such arrangements vary and are tailored to local need. In some cases, Community College faculty teach on the State University campus; in other cases, the instruction is offered on the Community College campus or elsewhere in the community.

Several campuses have asked that the Community Colleges offer all or part of the full year of remediation in English and mathematics provided to first-time freshmen scoring in the lowest quartile of the State University's English and mathematics entrance tests through the Intensive Learning Experience program described under Recommendation 1 above. The Chancellor's Office has issued the following guidelines for the administration of these programs, as well as all other cooperative arrangements:

1. Enrollment should not be counted for funding purposes in both the State University and the Community Colleges;
2. The Community College should be convenient to the State University campus, if the courses are not actually offered on the State University campus;
3. Such arrangements should not limit students' eligibility for financial aid;
4. The quality of the courses offered through a cooperative arrangement should be comparable to courses taught by the State University faculty; and
5. Both the course itself and the arrangement should be evaluated for effectiveness.

In addition, the Intensive Learning Experience courses, although not all cooperative courses, should be reduced in size to an average of 12 students per class.

Recommendation 4

"That the University of California and the California State University assist the high schools in defining the standards for college-preparatory courses and in providing staff development through activities like, but not limited to, the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project. That the University and the State University continue to monitor the preparation of incoming students from feeder high schools through entry-level diagnostic testing in all basic skills areas and report such data to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. (Also see Recommendation 9.)"

University of California

The University of California has taken an active role in defining standards for college-preparatory courses through an intersegmental Faculty Senate committee which has already prepared and distributed to the schools statements of competencies in English and mathematics and is currently working on similar statements in foreign languages, history/social science, and natural sciences. A competency statement in the visual and performing arts will be the next to be undertaken. The San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Irvine campuses have all held conferences to discuss with teachers and administrators the incorporation of these competencies into the high school curriculum.

In addition to this Academic Senate-based work, the University is continuing to provide staff development for elementary and secondary school teachers through long-standing projects like the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project. Eight University campuses sponsor summer writing institutes and in-service training throughout the year, while seven campuses are project sites in mathematics. Several campuses also offer summer science institutes; UCLA holds a summer literature program; and Berkeley sponsors a project for social studies teachers.

A preliminary inventory of activities that link the University with the schools, prepared by the University as supplementary material to its report on remediation, identifies more than 100 such projects. The list includes those activities which are University-wide or statewide in nature and those which are campus-based or local in nature. Both types of activities often involve other segments of higher education.

Examples of statewide activities are the Articulation Council, the California Mathematics Project, the California Writing Project, the California Academic Partnership Program, and the Community College Transfer Centers.

Examples of campus-based activities include mathematics or writing project programs on specific campuses and a number of partnership programs or conferences held by individual campuses with their surrounding feeder schools.

Because of the number of these activities and the fact that their breadth and scope are at least doubled when the State University's projects and those sponsored by individual Community Colleges are included, the segments have announced a plan to form a Joint Task Force on Planning and Coordination of Outreach and Student Preparation Programs. No details are yet available on the specific responsibilities of the group. It is clear, however, that some external evaluation must be performed to determine the efficacy of these many projects.

The University continues to monitor the preparation of its entering students through testing in both mathematics and English. All campuses of the University require those students who wish to enroll in mathematics classes to take a diagnostic test in elementary algebra, intermediate algebra, or precalculus, developed by a joint work group of University, State University, Community College, and high school faculty. Display 3 below shows that 21,764 students took these tests in 1984-85.

In contrast to mathematics, where only those students desiring to take a mathematics course are tested, all incoming freshmen must demonstrate writing proficiency either by scoring 600 or above on the College Board English Composition Test or a 3 or higher on the Advanced Placement Test, or by earning a grade of at least a "C" at another undergraduate institution in a course equivalent to the University's freshman English course. Those who do not meet this requirement prior to enrollment must take the Subject A examination, until this year developed and scored by each campus. Display 4 on page 15 indicates the number of entering freshmen in 1984-85 who did not meet the Subject A requirement by any means and who therefore had to take a Subject A course.

As noted in the staff's December 1985 progress report, the University will administer a systemwide Subject A examination in May 1987 to all high school students who have been admitted to the University but who have not demonstrated their writing proficiency. Scoring will be done uniformly and although each campus will still set its own cutoff score, the University of California will move much closer to a single writing standard for all students.

The University has reported to its feeder high schools data on the performance of their graduates as freshmen for over 40 years. These data currently include whether the student satisfied the Subject A requirement or had to take a remedial course in English or in mathematics. The test scores themselves are not replicated. The University sends these reports to the district superintendent, high school principal, and heads of the English and mathematics departments in every high school that has sent at least one student to any campus of the University the preceding year. The University does not send the reports, however, to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, or to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, as suggested in Recommendation 4. On pages 16-17 below, the Commission offers a suggestion regarding such transmittals.

The University is clearly carrying out the mandate it set for itself in working with the schools to improve student preparation. In Fall 1984, its Committee on Student Preparation issued *The University and the Schools: Educational Excellence, A Joint Responsibility*, the document which describes the University's overall plan and lists 12 recommendations or priorities for action. After a year and one- half review of that report by both University and school

DISPLAY 3 *Students Taking a Mathematics Diagnostic Test at the University of California in 1984-85*

UC Campus	Elementary Algebra	Intermediate Algebra	Precalculus	Total
Berkeley	187	531	1,906	2,624
Davis	75		3,000	3,075
Irvine		276	2,394	2,670
Los Angeles		1,138	3,398	4,536
Riverside		333	454	787
San Diego	274	3,054	1,098	4,426
Santa Barbara			3,246	3,246
Santa Cruz		200	200	400
Total				21,764

Source: *Progress Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on Implementing Recommendations from* Promises To Keep, *February 1, 1986*. Berkeley: Office of the President, University of California, p. 15.

DISPLAY 4 ***Percentage of Entering Freshmen from California Schools Required to Take Subject A Examination, Fall 1984***

UC Campus	Total Number	Number Not Satisfying Subject A Requirement	Percent Not Satisfying Subject A Requirement
Regular Admits			
Berkeley	3,244	879	27.1
Davis	2,553	1,173	45.9
Irvine	2,109	1,612	76.4
Los Angeles	3,398	1,816	53.4
Riverside	737	346	46.9
San Diego	2,237	1,734	77.5
Santa Barbara	2,424	1,427	58.9
Santa Cruz	1,143	783	68.5
Universitywide	17,845	9,770	54.7
Special Action Admits			
Berkeley	251	143	57.0
Davis	230	179	77.8
Irvine	165	163	98.8
Los Angeles	203	184	90.6
Riverside	93	62	66.7
San Diego	146	141	96.6
Santa Barbara	263	230	87.5
Santa Cruz	89	81	90.0
Universitywide	1,441	1,183	82.1

Source: *Progress Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on Implementing Recommendations from* Promises To Keep, *February 1, 1986.* Berkeley: Office of the President, University of California, p. 17a.

constituencies, the Office of the President recently hired an assistant vice president whose responsibility will be to implement the recommendations set forth both in that document and in a report on the University's teacher education programs. The University's Academic Senate and campus chancellors will be asked to cooperate fully in these efforts.

The California State University

Like the University of California, the California State University has been involved through its Academic Senate with the development of the competency statements mentioned on page 13 and has also established numerous partnership programs with the high schools both as a system and through individual campuses.

Systemwide programs include the California Writing Project, the California Mathematics Project, and the California Academic Partnership Program, among others. Ten State University campuses conduct writing projects, while mathematics projects operate on nine campuses. Nine campuses are also being funded through the California Academic Partnership Program to work intersegmentally to improve the preparation of students, particularly underrepresented students, for college.

In addition, the majority of State University campuses participate in activities with the high schools in their local service areas. These projects are designed to improve student or teacher skills, to develop the college preparatory curriculum, or to improve the representation of minorities. Selected examples of campus efforts include the following:

- Dominguez Hills has received $114,000 from the State Department of Education for the installation, implementation, and evaluation of a computer-based education laboratory at Carson High School.
- Fullerton's mathematics department is offering a section of first-year calculus at a local high school. The campus also sponsors a summer science and mathematics enrichment program on campus for high school juniors.
- Hayward provides staff development for the English faculty at Castlemont High School in Oakland as well as a guest speaker program for Castlemont honors students. This State University faculty also works with the faculty at Newark Memorial High School on staff and curriculum development in science.
- San Bernardino has established an "adopt-a-school" program with Cajon High School, a study skills project with local schools, an enrichment program for gifted and talented junior high school students, in-service activities for history and mathematics teachers, a critical thinking workshop for Riverside County schools, and in addition, has recently appointed a high school-university program coordinator.
- San Jose State University is working with the College Board on a project to increase enrollment in Advanced Placement courses, to increase the number of students taking Advanced Placement tests, and to increase the number of students taking the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test.
- San Francisco State University has been engaged for several years in the Learning Bridge program with Balboa High School in San Francisco where faculty from both institutions jointly discuss and develop curricular materials and teaching strategies in English, social science, mathematics, education, ethnic studies, humanities, and science.
- San Diego State University operates a cooperative writing program with San Diego Unified School District to develop faculty expertise in writing across the curriculum. San Diego, too, supports an "adopt-a-school" project with Granger Junior High School which is designed to orient minority students to college study.

Although this list is by no means exhaustive, it is meant to portray the variety of projects underway throughout the State University system. In addition, the State University is also collaborating with the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and will establish a Southern Service Center of the Laboratory at the Northridge campus. The Center will pursue activities designed to support school-based improvement, enhance teacher quality, advance promising models for schooling and learning, and prepare students for adult success. Improving the educational achievement of minority students will be a major focus of the program.

As mentioned under Recommendation 1 above, the State University proposed in its remediation reduction plan to measure the decline in the need for remediation by student scores on its entry-level English and mathematics tests. All entering or lower division students with fewer than 56 transferable semester units must take the English Placement Test unless they are exempted, and all first-time freshmen and undergraduate transfers, unless exempted, must pass the Entry-Level Mathematics Examination before they may enroll in any course which satisfies the quantitative reasoning requirement of the State University's general education-breadth program. These scores are not only given to the students and their college counselors but they are also sent back to the high schools and Community Colleges that prepared the students, in the hope that the information will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of those schools' college preparatory curricula.

Like the University of California, the State University does not send these reports to local boards of education or the Postsecondary Education Commission as requested in Recommendation 4, although it does send reports to the State Department of Education. The Commission's Advisory Committee on Student Performance Reporting has suggested that the cover letter accompanying the transmittal of these reports to district superintendents, high school principals, head counselors, and departmental heads of English and mathematics be sent to the chair of the local board of education. In this way, the board will be alerted to the arrival of the data, while it will still be the superintendent's responsibility to review the scores with the board. The Commission agrees with this idea and suggests that statewide summary data on the performance of first-time freshmen also be sent to the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Commission.

Recommendations 5 and 6

"That the California Community Colleges continue to be considered in the long term as the primary postsecondary provider of remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language in the State in addition to their academic, vocational, and community service functions.

"That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges establish an academic floor below which instruction would not be offered. That they redirect students below this level to the adult basic education program operated either by the local community college or school district. A reasonable period of time should be allowed before this floor is instituted."

Recommendation 5

In December 1985, staff of the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office brought to the Board of Governors four recommendations regarding academic standards and student progress. One of these recommendations virtually duplicates the wording of the Commission's fifth recommendation above, but with certain conditions and qualifications added:

> Community colleges should continue to be regarded in state policy as the primary postsecondary providers of remedial instruction and services in a setting where:
>
> a. the remedial instruction offered is designed solely for the purpose of raising students' language and computational skills to the levels required for success in college degree and certificate courses;
>
> b. there is mandatory assessment of students' skills at entrance;
>
> c. there is placement in degree- and certificate-level courses, based upon prerequisite skill levels required for success;
>
> d. there are adequate resources to monitor student progress and provide necessary follow-up support services; and
>
> e. there is opportunity for concurrent enrollment in remedial courses and non-remedial courses which do not have prerequisite skill requirements.

The Board of Governors declined to act on the four specific recommendations until broad consultation had been held with the field. Instead, it endorsed a set of principles consistent with the recommendations. Chancellor's Office staff has just completed comprehensive consultation with the colleges concerning the specific recommendations and will bring a report to the Board in July or September 1986 on their implementation.

Recommendation 6

It has always been the position of the Commission that an academic floor should be viewed as the final component of the comprehensive strategy recommended by the Commission to the Community Colleges in confronting remediation. Furthermore, this final piece of the puzzle cannot fit into the frame until the other recommendations related to remedial course credit, student assessment and program evaluation, articulation, and other issues, are in place.

In May 1985, the Board of Governors declared that the feasibility of an academic floor needed further study after comprehensive assessment, advisement, placement, student follow-up, and program evaluation occurred in the colleges, and that a comparative study should be made of remedial offerings in the Community Colleges and of the adult basic education courses in the K-12 adult schools.

Last December, however, the Board considered a position which is essentially an alternative proposal to the academic floor which states that:

1. Colleges should provide a full range of remedial instruction to meet the needs of their admitted students;

2. This range could be provided either by the colleges themselves or jointly by formalized mutual agreement with K-12 adult school programs; and

3. A limit be placed on the amount of remediation a student can take, with the colleges either setting a maximum of 30 semester units and 45 quarter units, establishing more rigorous probation and dismissal standards, or developing some combination of the two.

This proposal has been sent to the field for comment, as noted in the discussion of Recommendation 5.

The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan may exert a powerful external influence on the Community Colleges to establish the limits noted above. In the final draft of its reassessment of the Community Colleges, *The Challenge of Change*, the Commission recommends minimum academic skill levels appropriate for the different types of courses and programs offered, strengthened probation and dismissal standards, and a limit of 30 semester or 45 quarter credit units of remedial coursework that a student can take. The Master Plan Review Commission also suggests that students needing more remedial work than this should be directed to noncredit adult basic education programs.

Recommendations 7 and 8

"That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges take steps to ensure that all Community College districts establish comprehensive assessment/placement, advising, and follow-up programs to ensure adequate progress of remedial students. (Also see Recommendation 14.)"

"That the Community College districts enter into delineation of function agreements with feeder high school/districts within their boundaries regarding preparatory activities and courses in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language; such agreements may include cooperative arrangements for serving underprepared adults. The articulation agreements shall be transmitted to the Board of Governors."

Recommendation 7

In April 1983, then-Chancellor Hayward appointed a Task Force on Academic Quality whose first order of business was to define, develop, and propose a concept called "matriculation," whereby students might be assisted to make appropriate educational choices and to succeed in reaching their goals. The process to effect this purpose includes six components:

1. Application for admission;
2. Orientation;
3. Pre-enrollment assessment and educational planning;
4. Academic advisement/counseling and course selection;
5. Follow-up on student progress; and
6. Institutional research and evaluation.

The Board of Governors adopted a plan for implementing student matriculation in April 1984. The Legislature passed a bill that would have initiated a phase-in of matriculation in the Community Colleges, but the bill was vetoed by the Governor.

The following year, the Board of Governors unsuccessfully requested matriculation funding in the budget and, in addition, two separate funding bills were introduced that have been carried over to the current session. Since the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan has recommended that adequate funding be provided to implement matriculation, and since the Governor's prior vetoes stated his reluctance to fund matriculation before that Committee's deliberations were ended, it seems logically indicated that matriculation will finally receive State funding. Although many Community Colleges have already instituted some measure of a matriculation system, such additional funding is necessary to allow all colleges to build a comprehensive system that includes all six components serving a major portion of their student population.

Recommendation 8

No formal action has yet been taken by the Chancellor's Office to encourage individual colleges to review or establish delineation of function agreements with their feeder high schools/districts regarding preparatory courses and services. Chancellor's Office staff has recommended to the Board of Governors, however, that a comparative study be undertaken of remediation offered for credit in the Community Colleges and offered in adult noncredit programs within both high school and Community College districts and that this study should offer recommendations "concerning the proper delineation of the roles of remediation . . . ." The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan has also recommended a study of noncredit adult education and proposed that the Legislature strengthen current statutes by mandating local delineation of function agreements.

The Postsecondary Education Commission believes that initial work on delineation of function agreements need not be deferred until such a study is begun nor until close working relationships with high schools are established.

Recommendation 9

"That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges work with the University of California and the California State University to assist high schools in defining the standards for college-preparatory courses and in providing staff development through activities like, but not limited to, the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project. That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges encourage the Community College districts to monitor the preparation of incoming students from feeder high schools through entry-level diagnostic testing in all basic skills areas and report such data to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. (Also see Recommendation 4.)"

The Academic Senate of the Community Colleges has cooperated with senate colleagues in the other segments in developing and disseminating statements on academic competencies in English and mathematics and is developing similar statements for other disciplines. A new Academic Standards and Basic Skills unit within the Chancellor's Office will review and adopt, as appropriate, these existing standards as well as develop and establish statewide standards in all basic skills areas.

Working with the secondary schools is still a new concept for the Community Colleges as a whole, although an increasing number of individual colleges are working with their local high schools to increase communication about standards and expectations and facilitate student learning through a better integrated curriculum. The Chancellor's Office has submitted a budget augmentation request to support and promote articulation and academic partnerships with high schools, and the Commission supports this more active effort.

These funds would allow the Community Colleges to initiate a comprehensive system of student performance reporting to the high schools. Each year, approximately 40 percent of all California high school graduates enter Community College. Although about a third of the Community Colleges throughout the State provide information of some kind to their local high schools about the performance of these graduates, there is no organized statewide communication from the two-year colleges to high schools about the performance of first-time freshmen. Thus the interconnection between Community College performance and high school preparation, expectations, and standards is largely, if not entirely, ignored.

The University and State University already provide annual performance data to the high schools, and the full participation of the Community Colleges in this effort will complete the continuum.

Recommendation 10

"That neither the University of California nor the California State University shall grant baccalaureate credit for courses in reading, writing, and mathematics defined by the faculty as remedial in accord with each system's policy and that the award of workload credit should not affect the level of State funding for these remedial courses. Furthermore, that the University of California and the California State University shall describe the courses defined as remedial and report the number of students enrolled and the workload generated in these courses to the Commission by December 1, 1983, and during the following five years in which the University and the California State University implement their plans to reduce remediation."

University of California

When the Academic Senate of the University of California voted to remove degree credit from remedial coursework effective Fall 1984, the Senate defined remedial courses in English as those designed to fulfill the Subject A requirement and in mathematics as courses in arithmetic, beginning and intermediate algebra, geometry, and trigonometry. The Senate left to each campus the formulation of policy regarding credit for courses in English as a Second Language. In its February 1986 report, the University's Work Group on Student Preparation and Remedial Education noted that "for the most part, math and science faculty reported seeing no effects [of the Senate's policy]," largely because there was general agreement on the Senate's definition of remedial work in these disciplines (p. 17).

Because similar consensus does not exist on the definition of remedial work in English, the Senate resolution has had significant and often painful effects. Prior to passage of the Senate resolution, most campuses offered at least partial baccalaureate credit for Subject A courses; San Diego gave full credit for its introductory writing course required of *all* freshmen. Subsequent to the resolution, Davis and Los Angeles withdrew all degree credit from their Subject A courses and instead granted workload credit; Riverside continued its practice of giving workload credit only; Berkeley continued to grant two units of degree credit and two units of workload credit, after the campus Committee on Courses determined that the course content was not wholly remedial; Santa Barbara made the same decision, and like Irvine, now schedules an examination halfway through the quarter for students to demonstrate that they have met the Subject A requirement.

After the Senate resolution, San Diego introduced a writing test to identify students in need of remedial assistance. The campus estimated that establishing a remedial writing program would cost approximately $500,000 and moved to the cooperative arrangement with Mesa College which is described under Recommendation 3 above. If San Diego had not been at variance with the rest of the University campuses regarding the Subject A requirement, for whatever educational reasons, however sound, and if the University-wide Subject A test had already been in effect, the changes at San Diego may have been neither as expensive nor disruptive. Yet, the impact of the Senate resolution has been felt by campuses other than San Diego, as the Work Group on Student Preparation and Remedial Education points out (pp. 17-18):

> While a number of faculty and administrators believe that the withdrawal of credit from Subject A courses is appropriate and sends an important message to the schools, faculty teaching these courses reported that eliminating baccalaureate credit has had significant negative consequences. This may be partially ex-

plained by the fact that, according to these faculty, every campus has redesigned its Subject A curriculum over the past three to five years, making it much more demanding. Although these courses may include a review of some topics that students should have mastered in high school, they are primarily concerned with introducing students to the kinds of critical reading and writing that will be expected of them in University courses. For this reason, there was general consensus that delegating these courses to the community colleges is not appropriate; in the opinion of most writing instructors interviewed, comparable community college courses do not achieve University standards.

The withdrawal of credit has affected both student and faculty morale negatively. As one instructor said,"It is apparent by the second week of classes that students have a sense of discrepancy between what they are asked to do and the lack of credit they get. They are already demoralized." A consequence is that many students do not take the courses seriously, doing only the minimum amount of work required to pass the course. Many faculty are demoralized because they believe the withdrawal of credit is a sign that the University does not take the courses seriously.

Finally, withdrawal of credit has had budgetary consequences, because the removal of baccalaureate credit also means the elimination of state funding. Although the consequences of this change are not yet fully apparent, a number of faculty and administrators are concerned that University resources alone may not be sufficient in the future to meet the needs.

The response of the University to Recommendation 10 clearly indicates that further inquiry is needed.

The California State University

The California State University has adhered to the policy proposed in Recommendation 10 since 1980, when Chancellor's Executive Order 338 stipulated that entry-level learning skills courses could be offered for workload credit only and were not applicable to the baccalaureate degree.

Since December 1983, the University and State University have annually submitted the reports called for in the latter part of Recommendation 10 describing the courses defined as remedial and the number of students enrolled. Only the State University, however, has noted the workload generated by these courses. Display 5 below shows the three-year enrollment trend for each system. Before the next report is submitted, however, the format should be revised to show not only the gross number of enrollments in remedial courses as now recorded but the following:

1. Number of total enrollments in undergraduate English and mathematics courses;

2. Number of enrollments in remedial English and remedial mathematics courses as defined in *Promises To Keep*;

3. Percentage change in remedial enrollments;

4. Number of enrollments and percent change in remedial courses by student admission category; and

5. Total cost of remedial courses.

This information should be submitted by December 1 of each year both as summary systemwide data and by individual campus.

DISPLAY 5 *Total Enrollments in Remedial Courses in English and Mathematics as Submitted by the University of California and the California State University, 1982-83 - 1984-85*

Academic Year	University of California	The California State University
1982-83	Not Submitted	23,935
1983-84	12,675	27,108
1984-85	14,155	27,191

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission staff compilation of information from the segments.

Recommendations 11 and 12

"That the segments examine their policies and procedures to ensure that remedial coursework not granted baccalaureate degree credit by a four-year institution also not be identified as transfer credit by a two-year institution.

"That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges take steps to ensure that the Community College districts examine their policies and procedures regarding the granting of associate degree credit to remedial courses."

University of California

The University does not grant baccalaureate degree credit for any Community College course which would be considered remedial if taken at the University. The following guidelines, prepared by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), delineate when baccalaureate degree credit may be given to college algebra courses:

> *General Principle.* A student may be given baccalaureate credit for at most four semester units or six quarter units for any combination of College Algebra or Precalculus courses.
>
> *Intermediate Algebra.* A course that places major emphasis on the topics listed below should be labeled intermediate algebra. Students do not receive any baccalaureate credit for such a course. The topics are exponents and radicals, polynomials and factoring, operations with rational expressions, linear equations and inequalities in one or two variable and their graphs, systems of two linear equations, and quadratic equations.
>
> *College Algebra.* A course that has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite and places major emphasis on the topics listed below should be labeled College Algebra. Students receive full baccalaureate credit for such a course. This course is not normally a prerequisite to the calculus or analytic geometry/calculus sequence. The topics are systems of linear equations, matrices and determinants, theory of (polynomial) equations, permutations, combinations, binomial theorem, mathematical induction, and introduction to probability.
>
> *Precalculus.* A course that has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite and places major emphasis on the topics listed below should be labeled Precalculus. Students receive full baccalaureate credit for such a course. The topics are advanced algebra, elementary functions (logarithmic, exponential, and trigonometric), and analytic geometry.

Until the University develops a University-wide standard for Subject A, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools is recommending to the Community Colleges that to gain baccalaureate degree credit, all transferable composition courses must carry a prerequisite of either a prior composition course or passage of a standard exam, preferably with a composition component.

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools makes recommendations to the Academic Senate on admissions requirements and degree credit courses, among other responsibilities. It has members of the Community College Chancellor's staff and Academic Senate serving on its Subcommittee on Community College Articulation.

The California State University

Existing policy for the California State University precludes baccalaureate degree credit being awarded to any remedial coursework and also permits the Community Colleges to certify the nature of the courses being transferred to the State University both for baccalaureate and general education credit. Lists of transfer courses are sent annually by each Community College to the Office of the Chancellor of the State University. These transfer courses are accepted for credit unless challenged. The function is monitored by two committees: the Advisory Committee on Executive Order 167, which concerns itself with baccalaureate degree credit courses, and the Course Review Subcommittee of the General Education Advisory Committee, which consists of four State University faculty members and three from the Community Colleges.

California Community Colleges

In May 1985, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges approved the following uniform statewide definition of remediation and remedial courses and adopted Title 5 regulations prohibiting the award of associate degree credit for these courses or their certification for transfer:

> Remediation is that process which is designed to assist students to attain those learning skills necessary to succeed in college transfer, certificate or degree courses and programs, and includes classroom instruction as well as other support services interventions to assist students in the pursuit of their educational goals and objectives. Remedial instruction includes courses designed to develop reading or writing skills at or below the level required for enrollment in English courses one level below English 1A, mathematics courses below Elementary Algebra and English as a Second Language courses consistent with the levels defined for English.

The regulation language that pertains to standards for courses which may and may not be applied to the associate degree is still under review by the Office of Administrative Law, whose approval must be received before the regulations can take effect in the colleges. It is hoped that this language that imposes more rigorous criteria for courses that are granted credit toward a degree and identifies remedial and preparatory courses that are non-degree applicable will be implemented fully on the campuses by July 1, 1987. The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, the Chancellor's Task Force on Academic Quality, the Academic Senate, and many individuals throughout the Community Colleges agree that remedial courses should not apply to the associate degree nor be certifiable for transfer.

The Chancellor's Office anticipates using its planned information system, when it is implemented, to look at the rigor and consistency of the courses that Community Colleges transfer at the baccalaureate level. Before that review occurs, an intersegmental committee is establishing a common definition of what constitutes a baccalaureate-level course. This activity was initiated by the State University Chancellor's Office.

Recommendation 13

"That the University of California, the California State University, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, and the State Board of Education examine by no later than January 15, 1984, the clientele, provision of services, and potential growth of English as a Second Language services as a preliminary step in the development of a coherent philosophy and practical strategy to meet both current and future need."

All three segments have initiated a number of activities to determine the nature, status, and extent of their English as a Second Language (ESL) courses and services.

University of California

The University of California sent a survey soliciting information on ESL programs to each campus in Fall 1984. The results of this survey as well as the findings of a follow-up questionnaire have been transmitted to a Subcommittee on ESL appointed by the University Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education. This subcommittee has met several times this year to develop its charge and during the next academic year will begin a review of policy issues facing the University in the area of English as a Second Language. A representative from the State University Chancellor's Office has been an invited observer at these meetings. The establishment and work of the group reflects the growing concern of the University about the increasing number of students whose native language is not English and who need assistance to write and communicate effectively. As Display 6 on page 30 indicates, the number of University undergraduates with immigrant, permanent resident, or refugee visas has nearly doubled since 1979, and projections call for their continued growth.

The California State University

The State University, through its Advisory Committee on English as a Second Language, conducted a campus survey early in 1984 and transmitted its report to the Chancellor in June 1984. The system is reconvening a new advisory committee, consisting primarily of English and ESL faculty, to follow-up on the issues raised in that report. the University of California and the California Community Colleges have been invited to send representatives.

California Community Colleges

Two major reports on English as a Second Language within the Community Colleges have been presented to the Board of Governors since the Commission proposed that ESL demanded special scrutiny by the segments. A January 1984 report identified four policy areas in need of further work:

- Uniform course classification for ESL courses, both credit and noncredit;
- Determination of average daily attendance generated by ESL course offerings;
- Determination of actual demand for ESL since enrollment figures only report the "supply" side; and
- Development of a framework for future policy.

DISPLAY 6 Number of Undergraduates with Immigrant, Permanent Resident, or Refugee Visas at the University of California in Fall Quarter 1976, 1979, and 1984

UC Campus	1976	1979	1984
Berkeley	1,019	1,503	2,080
Davis	232	408	876
Irvine	241	530	1,657
Los Angeles	1,291	1,938	2,926
Riverside	78	123	292
San Diego	214	442	857
Santa Barbara	238	267	599
Santa Cruz	59	109	381
Total UC	3,372	5,320	9,668
Total Undergraduate Headcount	90,318	93,184	106,167
Percent of Total Headcount with Immigrant, Permanent Resident, or Refugee Visas	3.7%	5.7%	9.1%

Source: *Progress Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on Implementing Recommendations from* Promises To Keep, *February 1, 1986.* Berkeley: Office of the President, University of California, p. 6a.

A Chancellor's Task Force on ESL issues was established which sent a survey to the Community Colleges and then submitted its findings and recommendations to the Board of Governors in May 1985. The Board of Governors adopted this policy framework which addressed issues and proposed recommendations in the following areas:

- A uniform definition for ESL;
- Uniform statewide course classification;
- Criteria for credit and noncredit ESL;
- Uniform assessment and placement practices;
- Establishment of course content equivalencies for beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESL;
- Articulation and transferability of ESL with four-year colleges and universities, and
- ESL instructor qualifications.

In response to Board action, the Chancellor created a permanent advisory committee on ESL to work with staff on the implementation of the above activities.

In October 1985, Chancellor's Office staff, in conjunction with the advisory committee, developed a comprehensive taxonomy to illustrate the various levels of competence within English as a Second Language coursework. This taxonomy was submitted to the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for its work on remediation and should remain a valuable resource as that Commission and others continue their work on the topic.

Much of the data generated by the studies noted above has been shared between the segments at meetings called by the Postsecondary Education Commission. Because neither the data themselves nor the segmental meetings held to discuss the data seemed to be leading to "a coherent philosophy and practical strategy to meet both current and future need," as called for in Recommendation 13, the Statutory Advisory Committee has requested that the segmental representatives meet once again this spring under the aegis of the Postsecondary Education Commission. The purpose of this meeting is to make recommendations to the Statutory Advisory Committee on a future course of action concerning ESL efforts. A more complete report will be provided the Commission after this meeting occurs.

Recommendation 14

"That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges develop a set of alternative models for assessment/placement which individual colleges can adapt to the needs of their students. (Also see Recommendation 7.)"

Although the Community College matriculation plan, described earlier on page 21, contains assessment as a major component, there is as yet no agreement on a set of alternative models of assessment as called for in Recommendation 14. Survey information gathered by the Learning, Assessment, Retention Consortium of the California Community Colleges (LARC), with funding from the Chancellor's Office,indicates that by Fall 1984 at least 45 colleges had implemented mandatory skills assessment in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language for most students, and other LARC data show that the Community Colleges use a large number of diverse instruments for such testing. A number of these tests are college devised rather than standardized.

Assembly Bill 3 (Campbell) -- one of the two matriculation bills currently before the Legislature -- stipulates that no district or college may use any assessment instrument without authorization of the Chancellor and that the Chancellor should review all assessment instruments and establish an advisory committee for such a review. Whether or not this particular bill triggers the implementation of matriculation, it is clear that the current diversity of testing instruments and insufficient understanding of their use and effectiveness call for further study.

Much work remains to be done in this area by the Community Colleges, and the central focus of the new Academic Standards and Basic Skills Unit in the Chancellor's Office will be to develop statewide policy for assessment/placement in the Community Colleges. It is hoped that the work of the Committee on Assessment appointed by the Round Table on Educational Opportunity, whose purpose is to inventory the testing currently being imposed on college-bound and college-going youth, will clarify not only what testing is occurring across the segments but the issues that must be addressed.

Recommendation 15

"That all three segments, in the interest of improved articulation, explore with the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education the possibility of using appropriate postsecondary diagnostic tests so that high school students can be assured of consistent expectations between high schools and colleges and thus be encouraged to obtain the necessary skills before entering college."

As noted in the staff's July 1984 progress report to the Commission, the University of California and the California State University have cooperated for several years on administering diagnostic tests in algebra and precalculus to high school students. This work has been greatly expanded to reach between 100,000 and 150,000 high school students this current year with funding of $300,000 from the State received under the California Academic Partnership Program established by Assembly Bill 2398. It is projected that nearly 300,000 students will be eventually reached, particularly as a pre-algebra test becomes available for testing use at the eighth-grade level.

A number of University and State University campuses serve as service centers for the distribution and scoring of the Mathematics Diagnostic Test series at area high schools and for consultation with school personnel on the nature, purpose, and use of the test. Both the students and their teachers receive the test results so that the students' mathematical strengths and weaknesses can be identified and the curriculum can be modified, as needed. In this way, the college tests clarify standards in mathematics, allowing students to prepare themselves before they enter higher education.

Five University campuses have developed programs with local high schools to administer Subject A examinations to eleventh-grade students, while three State University campuses have administered the English Placement Test or the Entry-Level Mathematics Examination at the high school level. A pilot project to administer the mathematics examination at the Community College level has also been conducted at Butte College, Long Beach City College, and at several campuses in the Los Angeles Community College District.

Under the Academic Partnership Program, the University and State University are working to develop a joint testing program for the high schools in English. The Sacramento and Northridge campuses of the State University are working with their University neighbors, Davis and UCLA, in one northern California and one southern California project. The English Placement Test and the Subject A examination test for different skills, however, because the two higher education systems select from different student pools and have different expectations regarding the skills students should be expected to demonstrate. Thus, there is some doubt that a unified approach to English testing, using a single instrument, can be achieved as it has been in mathematics.

If a common instrument cannot be obtained, special care must be taken to coordinate diagnostic testing in English in the high schools so that students and staff alike are not overwhelmed or confused by too complex a system. The situation is further complicated by the new direct writing assessment soon to be introduced in the high schools by the State Department of Education under the California Assessment Program and by those Community Colleges who are involved in giving their own diagnostic tests in their local high schools. Students may end up being "helped" by the four education systems using four different means of assessment.

Apart from some individual campus efforts and the participation of faculty in the instrument design and development of the Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program, the Community Colleges as a whole are essentially just beginning their involvement with diagnostic testing of secondary students. Although the University and State University have established a successful working relationship on the matter of diagnostic testing in the high schools, as well as on several other initiatives sponsored by the Joint Projects Committee of the University and State University, the Community Colleges should now be considered a new partner in many of these efforts.

Recommendation 16

"That each segment develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a rigorous program evaluation model for remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, using some common criteria and common vocabulary to ensure comparability across segments and report the implementation on their campuses in their 1985 report. (See Recommendation 17.)"

University of California

Despite the numerous evaluations described in the University's progress report on remediation, the University has not established a rigorous program evaluation model for its remedial courses and services, as requested in Recommendation 16.

After the Commission's intersegmental conference on evaluation held at Asilomar in February 1984 and funded in part by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), the University held a follow-up evaluation workshop in May 1984 and another for mathematics faculty in April 1985; both workshops received partial funding from the Commission's FIPSE grant. Although Office of the President staff has worked on each of the recommendations resulting from the University's May 1984 workshop and has encouraged campus mathematics departments present at the April 1985 meeting to apply for an evaluation grant from the Commission, funded by FIPSE and eventually awarded to the Santa Cruz campus, no serious attempt has been made by the University to initiate independently an evaluation model or models that could be used by all campuses to evaluate their remedial courses and services.

A recent paper published by the Student Affairs Research and Information Office at Davis incorrectly assumes that a standard evaluation model "would have a formal orientation, a singular values perspective, and one primary audience -- program funders and oversight agencies" and "the oversight agency would make recommendations to the Legislature about whether and where remedial programs are working at the University, and whether or not these programs should continue" (Hunziker, 1986, p. 2). Perhaps this campus misperception is more widely spread and responsible for the University's apparent reluctance to assume a leadership role in developing an evaluation model. Such words as "common criteria," "common vocabulary," and "comparability across segments," as contained in the Commission's recommendation, do not mean that segments would be judged against each other nor that evaluation must be necessarily summative rather than formative in nature. Evaluation must first and foremost serve the instructor and the students. It is only then that the campus and the system can ultimately answer questions of accountability from the State.

Evaluation is both inevitable and necessary and must be designed to serve more than one audience, goal, and need. The University is eminently well-qualified to design rigorous program evaluation for its own remedial courses and services and to consult with the other segments regarding comparable models. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if ill-conceived evaluation were imposed externally rather than generated from within.

The California State University

In contrast, the California State University through the efforts of a systemwide committee which met during 1984-85, has developed guidelines for the evaluation of its remedial programs. These guidelines have been pilot-tested this year on the San Diego and Northridge campuses with funding from the Commission's grant from FIPSE. The guidelines will be modified and circulated for campus comments before the final version is incorporated as part of system policy on the evaluation of remedial programs. Although it is this kind of integrated approach that was meant by Recommendation 16, it is worth noting that several State University campuses have also undertaken their own research into the effectiveness of their remedial programs. Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, Hayward, Los Angeles, Northridge, and San Bernardino have examined their remediation activities in mathematics and English, and this year, the State University funded 11 campus-based evaluations of the English Placement Test and the programs developed to meet the needs of those students who were unsuccessful on the test. Reports on these latter evaluations will be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by June 30, 1986. The State University has also awarded a contract for an external evaluation of the English Placement Test/Writing Skills programs at Long Beach, Hayward, and Stanislaus, and a major three-year contract to an external source to evaluate the effectiveness of the Intensive Learning Experience and Summer Bridge programs.

California Community Colleges

After the intersegmental conference sponsored by the Commission in February 1984 at the Asilomar Conference Center, the California Community Colleges held six regional workshops funded in part by the Commission's FIPSE grant where guidelines for developing evaluation models were presented and colleges were encouraged to develop such models. In Spring 1985, the next step was taken under the FIPSE grant: Five colleges pilot-tested evaluation programs in reading, writing, or mathematics, and submitted reports on their efforts to the Commission in the summer. In Fall 1985, these evaluation models were themselves evaluated by an external consultant hired by the Commission; the consultant recently submitted his report which will be reviewed before the results of the project are made available to the field.

The Commission's effort to encourage the campuses to develop evaluation models which can be widely used appears to have been the model for the approach taken recently by the Learning, Assessment, Retention Consortium of the California Community Colleges (LARC). In a March 12 letter to all chief executive officers and chief instructional officers of the Community Colleges, LARC leadership asks for the colleges to indicate if they wish to participate in the development and implementation of a student outcomes evaluation model. A study design will be developed this spring with pilot-testing scheduled for 1986-87, if funding is available. It is hoped that LARC's efforts will build upon the Commission's work, rather than duplicating it

In its reassessment study of the Community Colleges, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan notes that "there is relatively little statewide institutional research available to evaluate the effectiveness of Community College transfer, vocational, or remedial programs . . ." and it recommends "that the governing boards of the segments jointly establish research programs to evaluate student preparation, persistence, and performance . . ." and that "the Board of Governors establish a . . . program to evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment/counseling/placement [process]." The Postsecondary Education Commission would only reiterate the need for such evaluation and the importance of its being developed with the cooperation of campus faculty.

Recommendation 17

"That the University of California, the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges report biennially by December 1 to the California Postsecondary Education Commission regarding each segment's progress on each of the applicable recommendations in this report. These reports shall commence in 1985; after the third such report, the Commission will determine if further reports are necessary."

None of the three segments submitted its report by December 1985. Future reports are expected by December 1, 1987, and December 1, 1989, and should be complete, comprehensive, and logically ordered documents that allow the Commission and its staff to determine the progress of the segments in meeting the recommendations of *Promises To Keep*.

February 18, 1986

Director Patrick M. Callan
California Postsecondary Education
  Commission
1020 - 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Pat:

Enclosed you will find the University's progress report on implementing applicable recommendations from the California Postsecondary Education Commission's publication, Promises To Keep. We are also including copies of the following supplementary materials in support of the report:

* A copy of the Frazer Committee report, The University and the Schools: Educational Excellence, A Joint Responsibility

* A copy of the recent remediation study

* A copy of the draft inventory we have begun

* A copy of the ESL study

If you have any questions about any of this material, I'll be happy to discuss it with you.

Sincerely,

James S. Albertson
Associate Vice President

Enclosures

cc: Vice President Frazer
Assistant Vice President Cox
University Dean Brugger
Director Condren
Coordinator Stanbrough

PROGRESS REPORT
TO THE
CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
ON
IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROMISES TO KEEP

February 1, 1986

University of California
Office of the President

February, 1986

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
PROGRESS REPORT TO THE CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION ON IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROMISES TO KEEP

This report with its accompanying supportive materials has been prepared in response to Recommendation 17 in *Promises To Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public College and Universities*, a study prepared by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). In CPEC's study, nine recommendations apply to the University, and this is a progress report on the University's activities to implement them.

Recommendation 1. That the University of California and the California State University each develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a plan whose goal is to reduce remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language within a five year period to a level consonant with the principles of both quality and access as determined by each segment. In developing such plans, the segments should take into account the anticipated effects of increased admissions requirements and the steps taken by the high schools to improve student preparation. These plans shall be transmitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for review and comment.

Response. A Universitywide Committee on Remediation was appointed by Associate Vice President Albertson and met for nine months to explore the implications of this recommendation and to develop the University's response. The Committee's report was sent to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in February, 1984. The report did not include English as a Second Language programs; a separate study on ESL Programs was conducted later by the

University. Comments on this study are included under Recommendation 13. In the February report to CPEC, the Committee on Remediation took the position that although the University would like to reduce remedial instruction and services on its campuses, students who were admitted to the University and needed academic assistance to succeed should receive it. The report also concluded that real reduction in the need for remediation would result only when K-12 schools are improved and that the University should strengthen its commitment to work with the schools to help them achieve improvement. The University is following through on this commitment as response to Recommendation 4 indicates.

In the report to CPEC the University also committed itself to exploring possible arrangements with community colleges to have remedial instruction provided by them. Such arrangements will be discussed under Recommendation 3.

As part of its effort to monitor progress in the reduction of remedial education, the University has recently conducted a study of the status of remediation on its campuses. A copy of the results of this study are included with this report as supplementary material. In addition, the Office of the President staff are in the process of establishing a Student Longitudinal System, which will enable the University to monitor the level of students' preparation upon entry to the University. This system will include data related to undergraduate students' academic performance, persistence, and graduation. A user's group is now developing recommendations about the elements that need to be added to the University's existing Corporate Data Base to implement this system. The system is expected to be operational by September, 1986, and is scheduled to be in effect for at least five years.

Recommendation 2. That the University of California and the California State University in the interim continue to offer or make available remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language to the degree dictated by the needs of incoming students as determined by appropriate assessment. In the interest of better coordination and integration, each segment should examine the means by which its campuses offer remediation in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, in order to ensure maximum quality, responsiveness to student need, lowest cost, and least duplication.

Response. The remediation study conducted by the University in Fall, 1985, collected information on all remedial courses offered by the University, on 1984-85 enrollments in these courses, on arrangements campuses have made to offer remedial courses in cooperation with community colleges, on diagnostic tests used by the campuses, and on evaluation models used to assess remedial courses. In addition, qualitative judgments about the current status of student preparation and remedial instruction on all campuses has been gathered.

Table I below shows enrollments in courses designed to help students meet the Subject A requirement. From 1983-84 to 1984-85 there is an apparent enrollment increase of 766 students. However, the changing enrollment figures are partly the result of including courses at the Santa Cruz campus and Riverside's Qualifier Courses--interdisciplinary courses which satisfy the Subject A requirement. These changes are part of the sorting process campuses are undergoing to comply with the Senate Resolution to withdraw credit from remedial courses. At Davis the increase is due largely to an increase in the number of students whose native language is not English. Enrollments at San Diego are not included because students were not separated into remedial courses until Fall, 1985.

Table II shows an increase in enrollments in remedial mathematics courses of 704 students. However, including UC Irvine's remedial mathematics enrollments for 1984-85 more than accounts for that increase. In general, enrollments in remedial math courses have dropped some.

Interviews with faculty for the University's recent remediation study reveal a wide range of opinion on the current status of student's preparation, but there is general agreement that the decline of the 1970's has been arrested, and some see signs of an upward trend. Standardized test scores as well as the slight decline in

TABLE I

Pre-Subject A, Subject A, Writing Courses with a Remedial Component

Course Titles	Enrollments 83-84	Enrollments 84-85	Degree Credit 83-84	Degree Credit 84-85	Workload Credit 83-84	Workload Credit 84-85
Berkeley						
Subject A1, Introduction to Language	1,247	1,168	2	2	2	2
Subject A1-C, Introduction to Language (cont.)		42		2		0
Asian American Studies		51		2		2
Davis						
English A, Language Skills	1,269	1,569	2	0	2	4
English R, Communication Skills Workshop	34	60	2	0	2	4
Irvine						
Writing 39A	1,365	1,415	4	2	0	2
Writing Workshop	393	413	2	0	0	2
Los Angeles						
English 1, Fundamentals of Exposition	1,351	1,367	2	0	2	4
English A, Basic Review of English Language	86	90	0	0	4	4
Riverside						
Basic Writing 1	277	275	0	0	4	4
Basic Writing 2A, B	54	77	0	0	4	4
Qualifier Courses		100		0		0
San Diego						
None (students were not separated and placed in remedial classes until Fall, 1985)						
Santa Barbara						
English 1, English Composition	2,022	1,879	2	2	2	2
Santa Cruz						
Writing 10 Subject A Tutorial	____	358				
TOTAL	8,098	8,864				

TABLE II

Pre-Calculus Mathematis Courses and Course Credits

		Enrollments		Degree Credit		Workload Credit	
	Course Titles	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85	83-84	84-85
Berkeley							
Math P	Algebra Trigonometry	614	494	2	2	2	2
Math PS	Self-Paced Algebra & Trigonometry	519	556	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2
Davis							
Math B	Algebra	75	67	0	0	3	3
Math C	Trigonometry	76	104	0	0	3	3
Math D	Intermediate Algebra	323	444	0	0	3	3
Math Pre-16A	Algebra & Trigonometry	369	470	0	0	3	3
Co 16A,B	Supplemental for 16A, B			0	0	1	1
Math Pre-21A	Functions, Problem Solving			0	0	3	3
Co 21 A,B,C	Supplemental for 21 A,B,C			0	0	1	1
Irvine							
Math 1	Algebra		1,122		0		4
Math 1A	Algebra		90		0		4
Chem 10			370		0		4
Los Angeles							
Math M	Algebra	16	15	0	0	4	4
Math 1A,B	Intermediate Algebra	1,116	477	2	0	2	4
Chem A	Problem Solving	142	Not Offered	0		4	
Riverside							
Math 3	Basic Math	117	155	0	0	4	4
San Diego							
Mesa Math 103	Intermediate Algebra		28		0		4
Mesa Math 140	College Algebra		255		0		4
Santa Barbara							
Math 1	College Algebra	494	347	4	0	0	4
Math 1S	Self-paced College Algebra	256	192	0	1-4	0	1-4
Math 1M	Computer-aided College Algebra	304	41	0	0	4	4
Santa Cruz							
Math 1A,B,C	Basic Mathematics	166	94	0	0	1	5
	TOTAL	4,587	5,291				

enrollments in some remedial courses would seem to support this view.

After a steady decline through the 1970's, mean SAT scores of entering UC freshmen have remained stable for the past five years, with a slight increase in mathematics scores in the past three years. Similarly, scores on the English Composition and Mathematics Achievement Tests have remained essentially stable since 1979. These changes parallel state and national trends. (Tables III and IV) While current mean scores are substantially below those of the late 1960's and early 70's, the fact that the decline has been arrested is in itself an encouraging sign.

The trends in test scores vary among the campuses. Average scores on the SAT Verbal test have gone up at Berkeley and UCLA since 1979, while scores at all other campuses have declined, with Santa Barbara showing the smallest decline and Riverside, the largest. SAT Mathematics test scores have gone up at Berkeley, UCLA and Santa Cruz and stayed almost the same at other campuses. (Tables V and VI)

There has been little change in the nature of students' preparation problems, judging from faculty assessments of their beginning students. Students have difficulty with analysis, reading, writing, conceptualization, interpretation, and synthesis.

TABLE III

Mean SAT Scores

	SAT-Verbal			SAT-Mathematics		
	Nat'l.	Calif.	UC Enter. Freshmen	Nat'l.	Calif.	UC Enter. Freshmen
1960	---	---	535	---	---	552
1968	466	---	561	492	---	593
1970	460	---	553	488	---	585
1971	455	---	544	488	---	583
1972	453	464	543	484	493	581
1973	445	452	533	481	485	575
1974	444	450	525	480	484	572
1975	434	435	510	472	473	564
1976	431	430	507	472	470	562
1977	429	427	504	470	470	564
1978	429	427	505	468	466	564
1979	427	428	500	467	473	563
1980	424	424	495	466	472	599
1981	424	426	493	466	475	557
1982	426	425	493	467	474	560
1983	425	421	490	468	474	566
1984	426	421	491	471	476	564

Sources: College Board, Admissions Testing Program Reports, College-Bound Seniors, 1972-1984. University of California, Preliminary Report Concerning College Entrance Examination Board Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores, Fall 1960; and University of California Frequency Distribution of College Board Examinations, 1968-84. National data for 1968-1971 are estimates made for College Entrance Examination Board, On Further Examination: Report of the Advisory Panel on the Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline, Willar Wirtz, Chairman (New York: College Board, 1977).

TABLE IV

Mean Achievement Test Scores

	English Composition Test			Mathematics (Level I)		
	Nat'l.	Calif.	UC Enter. Freshmen	Nat'l.	Calif.	UC Enter. Freshmen
1968	---	---	560	---	---	586
1969	---	---	563	---	---	577
1970	---	---	558	---	---	584
1971	---	---	556	---	---	582
1972	516	525	550	541	551	575
1973	517	519	542	537	543	567
1974	517	515	532	545	547	565
1975	515	508	*	545	545	*
1976	532	521	533	546	543	558
1977	516	505	*	547	541	555
1978	512	498	*	541	536	547
1979	514	501	509	537	521	530**
1980	518	503	508	536	520	527
1981	512	495	502	539	519	527
1982	520	499	505	545	522	531
1983	518	497	505	543	521	531
1984	518	492	503	542	517	526

* These data are not reliable.

** In 1979 the University began requiring virtually all students to take Mathematics (Level I). As a consequence, 15% more students took Mathematics (Level I) in that year than had taken it in previous years.

Sources: College Board, Admissions Testing Program Reports, College-Bound Seniors, 1972-84; University of California, Preliminary Report Concerning College Entrance Examination Board Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores, Fall 1960; and University of California, Frequency Distribution of College Board Examinations, 1968-84.

TABLE V

Mean SAT and Achievement Scores, By Campus, for UC Entering Freshmen

	SAT - Verbal			SAT - Mathematics		
	1972	1979	1984	1972	1979	1984
Berkeley	537	524	541	593	599	613
Davis	539	506	482	588	565	564
Irvine	533	477	452	573	548	546
Los Angeles	520	486	491	565	555	562
Riverside	517	499	460	535	544	527
San Diego	542	510	483	582	568	559
Santa Barbara	532	486	469	552	539	532
Santa Cruz	604	522	503	615	550	555
Total UC	543	500	491	581	563	564
National Mean	453	427	426	484	467	471

	English Composition			Mathematics (Level I)		
	1972	1979	1984	1972	1979	1984
Berkeley	549	532	552	582	559	562
Davis	551	512	497	581	536	532
Irvine	541	488	465	571	520	515
Los Angeles	528	495	506	561	523	524
Riverside	525	506	469	535	522	506
San Diego	551	516	492	577	533	526
Santa Barbara	538	498	484	551	508	501
Santa Cruz	602	532	510	597	511	521
Total UC	550	509*	503	575	530*	526
National Mean	516	514	518	541	537	542

* It is important to understand, in interpreting these numbers, that a much larger proportion of entering UC students takes the English Composition and Mathematics (Level I) exams than is true nationally. It is also true that all of the national and UC scores in this table differ significantly well beyond the .001 level because of the large numbers of students involved.

Sources: College Board, Admissions Testing Program Reports, 1972-1979, and 1984; and University of California, Frequency Distribution of College Board Examiantions, 1972, 1979, and 1984.

TABLE VI

Change in SAT & Achievement Test Scores
UC Entering Freshmen
1979-1984, and 1972-1984

	79-84	72-84	79-84	72-84	79-84	72-84	79-84	72-84
National	-1	-27	+4	-13	+4	+2	+5	+1
California	-7	-43	+3	-17	-9	-33	-4	-34
UC Total	-9	-52	+1	-17	-6	-47	-4	-49
Berkeley	+17	+4	+14	+20	+20	+3	+3	-20
Davis	-24	-57	-1	-24	-15	-54	-4	-49
Irvine	-25	-81	-2	-27	-23	-76	-5	-56
Los Angeles	+5	-29	+7	-3	-11	-22	+1	-37
Riverside	-39	-57	-17	-8	-37	-56	-16	-29
San Diego	-27	-59	-9	-23	-24	-59	-7	-51
Santa Barbara	-17	-63	-7	-20	-14	-54	-7	-50
Santa Cruz	-19	-101	+5	-60	-22	-92	+10	-76

Sources: College Board, Admissions Testing Program Reports, 1972, 1979, 1984 and University of California, Frequency Distribution of College Board Examinations, 1972, 1979, and 1984.

Although the general decline in student preparation appears to have stabilized, there is growing concern on the campuses about another preparation issue--the increasing number of students whose native language is not English, and who need additional training in language skills in order to write and communicate effectively. All general campuses have experienced growth in the numbers of immigrant, permanent resident, and refugee students; the number of UC undergraduates in these categories has almost doubled since 1979. (Table VII) Projections call for continued growth of these groups. Many immigrant and refugee students are quite able in non-verbal areas, such as mathematics or art, but suffer serious problems with English. They often have high SAT scores in math and high grade point averages. As their numbers grow, demands for English as a Second Language courses have grown. (See response under Recommendation 13.)

Recommendation 3. That the University of California and the California State University explore cooperative arrangements with institutions such as Community Colleges and K-12 adult schools to provide remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language.

Response. Cooperative arrangements for community college faculty to teach the University's remedial courses have been established at UC Berkeley, UC Los Angeles, and UC San Diego. UC Santa Barbara plans such an arrangement with Santa Barbara Community College in 1986-87 in mathematics if certain problems can be resolved. These problems

TABLE VII

Number of UC Undergraduates with Immigrant, Permanent Resident, or Refugee Visas

Fall Quarter

Campus	1976	1979	1984
Berkeley	1,019	1,503	2,080
Davis	232	408	876
Irvine	241	530	1,657
Los Angeles	1,291	1,938	2,926
Riverside	78	123	292
San Diego	214	442	857
Santa Barbara	238	267	599
Santa Cruz	59	109	381
Total UC	3,372	5,320	9,668
Total Undergraduate Headcount	90,318	93,184	106,167
Percent of total headcount with Immigrant, Permanent Resident, or Refugee Visas	3.7%	5.7%	9.1%

Source: Official Enrollment Census Files, 1976-79 and Corporate Student System (1984).

include locating space on campus for offering the community college courses, paying the community colleges for the additional workload, assuring that enough qualified community college faculty are available, and working out the differences in pay scale between community college instructors and University teaching assistants.

The arrangement between UC Berkeley and Vista Community college is a fledgling effort, after several years of discussion and negotiation to resolve problems similar to those for the Santa Barbara campus. Two sections of Math P, for which students receive community college credit but not University credit, were scheduled to be taught by Vista faculty in Fall, 1985, but only one section was offered. Berkeley administrators speculate that scheduling the courses in the evening was the major deterrent to enrollment. The campus believes that the small class size which Vista can offer will be an advantage to students and plans to continue working with Vista to have Math P and PS taught by Vista faculty.

At UC Los Angeles, beginning in 1981, Chemistry 17 has been offered for no baccalaureate degree credit through Los Angeles Community College. The college has not received ADA (average daily attendance) funding for this course because it has been a course contracted for and not normally offered in the district. UCLA, therefore, has paid the instructor's salary. However, beginning in January, 1986, the course will become a regular part of the district's curriculum and so will be funded through ADA. Although there have been some administrative problems with enrollment procedures, the arrangement seems to be working well, otherwise.

The campus which has the largest program of cooperative teaching arrangements with a community college is UC San Diego. This campus began a program with Mesa Community College in Fall, 1983 in which community college instructors teach the Intermediate Algebra and College Algebra courses on the UC San Diego campus for UC San Diego students. Students are carefully screened through diagnostic examinations. Class size is small (30 at the community college compared to 200-300 students per class at the University); instructors are experienced; course syllabi have been designed jointly by UC and community college faculty. Students who take these courses do as well as others in later, more advanced mathematics classes. Mathematics faculty at UC San Diego like the fact that students in pre-calculus and calculus courses have already achieved a certain, predictable level of preparation. Instructors are paid by the community college through ADA funding. Both faculty and administrators at UC San Diego feel that this program is very successful.

In Fall, 1985, UC San Diego also began a program in English with Mesa Community College. After ten years of variance, the campus was required to institute the administration of a Subject A examination and a program of courses for students who do not meet the University's Subject A requirement. This was a major change for the campus, having both pedagogic and economic ramifications. The campus's writing program was founded and developed on the principles that students learn better if they are not grouped by skill levels, that all freshmen students need some kind of writing assistance, and that there is no exact line between remedial and non-remedial writing where one kind of teaching stops and another starts. Beginning a new writing program for nearly 1,300 students identified as having below-standard skills was estimated to cost around $500,000.

To consider how to handle this new requirement in English, a campus-wide task force was appointed. The most practical solution, they agreed, was arranging for Mesa Community College to teach the remedial writing courses. The University hired a Subject A Coordinator to work with the Mesa College Dean of off-campus programs. In the San Diego program with Mesa in English, Mesa recruits and hires faculty. UC tests incoming students and places them in the course. The writing course has been designed by the Community College Dean for off-campus programs and Mesa

English faculty with the UC Subject A Coordinator's suggestions. Plans are to test the students at the end of the course with a test comparable to the initial Subject A tests. It is anticipated that around 80% will pass. Mesa pays for instruction from ADA. Courses are taught on the UC San Diego campus for no University credit.

This has not been an easy change for the campus. As on other campuses, there are those who feel that the University should be out of the remedial education business and who think that Subject A courses can be well handled by community colleges. There are others, however, who believe that it is wrong of the University to turn its students over to the community colleges or other outside agencies and that, in fact, the programs and students will suffer undeservedly if the University does this.

Opinion is also divided in the University over the idea of moving Subject A courses to the community colleges and the removing of credit from these courses. Contributing to the difficulty is that different University constituencies have different interpretations for what is remedial in writing. It is too early to evaluate the program in writing with Mesa or the consequences of the San Diego task force's decision. It is clear that faculty on other campuses have a keen interest in how the San Diego programs fare.

In mathematics, the situation is quite different. In the Fall, 1983, when the Mesa program was begun, there was general agreement between mathematics faculty at UC San Diego and Mesa Community College on how the Intermediate Algebra and the College Algebra courses would be set up and evaluated. There was common consent about instructors and curricula. In the views of the UC San Diego mathematics faculty, the program works very well; students come into pre-calculus courses well prepared.

Recommendation 4. That the University of California and the California State University assist the high schools in defining the standards for college-preparatory courses and in providing staff development through activities like, but not limited to, the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project. That the University and the State University continue to monitor the preparation of incoming students from feeder high schools through entry-level diagnostic testing in all basic skills areas and report such data to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Response. To articulate more clearly the academic competencies expected of students upon entry to a college or university, an intersegmental faculty senate committee from the University of California, the California State University and California Community Colleges is preparing statements of these competencies in foreign languages, history/social science, and natural sciences. The natural sciences statement will be ready for distribution early in 1986, and the other two statements are expected to follow before the end of the 1985-86 academic year. Statements of competencies in English and mathematics have already been prepared and distributed to schools. In addition, the University has hosted regional conferences on the San Diego and Santa Barbara campuses during Fall, 1985 to discuss with teachers and administrators how to incorporate these competencies into the curriculum. UC Irvine plans a similar regional conference for Spring, 1986.

A University Committee on Student Preparation prepared a report for President Gardner in Fall, 1984 entitled The University and the Schools: Educational Excellence, A Joint Responsibility, a copy of which is included with this document. The Committee made twelve recommendations on how the University could expand its activities with schools and work more closely with K-12 educators to strengthen academic programs. For the past year the report and its recommendations have been reviewed by both University and school constituencies. Implementation of these recommendations is expected to result in stronger University/school ties and an increased number of academic improvement and school-based research activities.

The University is committed to working with schools to strengthen education in California and has developed a wide range of activities to help improve teaching and strengthen academic programs in schools. All UC campuses are involved in the California Writing Project (CWP). As CWP sites, all campuses hold summer institutes and follow-up workshops for teachers of writing. Seven UC campuses host institutes and workshops for elementary and secondary school mathematics teachers as part of the California Mathematics Project. In addition, several campuses independently offer summer science institutes. UCLA sponsors a summer program for humanities teachers; Santa Cruz has developed a Network for Educational Excellence, which involves both mathematics and science teachers; and Berkeley sponsors, with the State Department of Education, the Clio Project for social studies teachers.

Several campuses have initiated academic improvement partnerships with clusters of local schools--usually a combination of elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools--to assist the schools in curriculum development and instructional improvement. Berkeley works with Oakland schools to improve the teaching of college preparatory mathematics in the ACCESS-Cooperative College Preparatory Program. The campus has also initiated the School/ University Project for Educational Renewal (SUPER) with clusters of schools in Albany, El Cerrito, and Richmond. Irvine has developed Project STEP in cooperation with CSU Fullerton, Rancho Santiago College, and the Santa Ana school district to promote academic excellence and equality through seminars and workshops with teachers, meetings with parents, and counseling and tutoring activities with students. Davis is planning the University/Schools

Cooperative Research and Extension Program in Education patterned after the University's Cooperative Extension programs in agriculture. Under the proposed program, basic and applied research methods will be used to solve educational problems. UCLA has established the Office of Academic Interinstitutional Programs, staffed by a Dean and several professional staff members, with a charge to develop and implement activities involving the University and surrounding schools and colleges in cooperative efforts to improve the quality of education.

A preliminary inventory of cooperative University/school programs and activities has identified more than 100 such projects. A copy of this inventory is submitted with this report as supplementary information. The University plans to compile in 1986 a comprehensive inventory of University/school activities, including school-based research projects. The University has sought State funding to help establish collaborative programs that would strengthen curriculum and instruction in selected feeder schools with high enrollments of underrepresented minority students. This program will allow University faculty and staff to work directly with K-12 school teachers and administrators throughout the academic year and in summer institutes and will contribute directly to the clarification of University standards and the strengthening of academic programs.

Diagnostic testing in mathematics is now being done on all UC campuses for those entering students who want to enroll in mathematics classes. Tests in elementary algebra, intermediate algebra and precalculus have been developed by a joint group of UC and CSU mathematics faculty over the past eight years. In 1984-85 these tests were given to more than 21,000 students on UC campuses as Table VIII shows.

Table VIII

UC Campus	EA	IA	PC	Total
Berkeley	187	531	1,906	2,624
Davis	75		3,000	3,075
Irvine		276	2,394	2,670
Los Angeles		1,138	3,398	4,536
Riverside		333	454	787
San Diego	274	3,054	1,098	4,426
Santa Barbara			3,246	3,246
Santa Cruz		200	200	400
				21,764

Mathematics faculty report that better identification of students' preparation has helped strengthen both precalculus and calculus classes at the University.

The tests are now being used by many high schools as well. With State funding in 1985-86 of around $300,000, the tests were administered to between 100,000 and 150,000 students. Projections are that the number of students taking the tests will increase to around 300,000 within the next year or two, particularly when a pre-algebra test is available to administer to eighth-grade students. Test results from current tests are returned to teachers and students so that students' mathematical strengths and weaknesses can be identified and so that changes in curriculum can be made. These tests help clarify for schools University standards in mathematics.

While only those students desiring to take mathematics are given a placement exam, all incoming freshmen have been required to demonstrate writing proficiency at entrance. Those who do not meet this requirement must enroll in a Subject A course. Each campus has developed and administered its own essay examination to assess the proficiency of students who have not already met the requirement prior to Fall enrollment (by scoring 600 or above on the CEEB English Composition Test, by scoring 3 or above on the Advanced Placement Composition Test, or by taking a college course in composition before enrolling at the University). Percentages of students who do not meet the requirement vary from campus to campus for a variety of reasons: variation in average campus scores on the College Board

English Composition test, differences in the number of non-native speakers of English enrolled, and variation in high school preparation of typical entering freshmen. Table IX indicates the number of California high school students by campus who did not meet the writing requirement in Fall, 1984.

In May, 1987, the University will begin to administer to incoming freshmen students a Universitywide essay examination to assess students' writing proficiency instead of administering exams campus by campus. Scoring will be done uniformly for all students. Sample tests and information about the examination will be distributed to all high schools prior to the first administration of the exam. The exam is being pilot-tested this year on UC campuses. Administering a Universitywide examination will set a single writing standard for all students and will assist the campuses in placement of students.

Five campuses have developed programs with high schools to administer Subject A examinations to eleventh-grade students. This testing program is seen by all participating schools as a valuable method of helping teachers and students understand the University's writing and reading standards and of developing good University/school relationships. The University plans to expand this program as funds permit.

TABLE IX

Percentage of Entering Freshmen from California Schools Required to Take Subject A Fall, 1984

Campus	Total No.	No. Not Satisfying Subject A Requirement	% Not Satisfying Subject A Requirement
Regular Admits			
Berkeley	3244	879	27.1
Davis	2553	1173	45.9
Irvine	2109	1612	76.4
Los Angeles	3398	1816	53.4
Riverside	737	346	46.9
San Diego	2237	1734	77.5*
Santa Barbara	2424	1427	58.9
Santa Cruz	1143	783	68.5
Universitywide	17845	9770	54.7
Special Action Admits			
Berkeley	251	143	57.0
Davis	230	179	77.8
Irvine	165	163	98.8
Los Angeles	203	184	90.6
Riverside	93	62	66.7
San Diego	146	141	96.6
Santa Barbara	263	230	87.5
Santa Cruz	89	81	90.0
Universitywide	1441	1183	82.1

Number and Percentage of Fall, 1983 Entering Freshmen from California Schools with 600 or Higher on the College Board English Composition Test

Campus	No. of Freshmen Scoring 600 or Higher on ECT	% of Freshmen Scoring 600 or Higher on ECT	Mean Score on ECT
Berkeley	1442	36.6	552
Davis	431	16.2	497
Irvine	228	10.0	465
Los Angeles	751	19.9	506
Riverside	49	9.4	469
San Diego	381	15.4	492
Santa Barbara	299	11.0	484
Santa Cruz	302	21.6	510
Universitywide	3904	19.5	503

* Source for both tables: Corporate Student System

Recommendation 10. That neither the University of California nor the California State University shall grant baccalaureate credit for courses in reading, writing, and mathematics defined by the faculty as remedial in accord with each system's policy and that the award of workload credit should not affect the level of State funding for these remedial courses. Furthermore, that the University of California and the California State University implement their plans to reduce remediation.

Response. The Academic Senate passed a resolution in March, 1983 removing credit from remedial coursework effective Fall, 1984. The resolution defined remedial coursework in mathematics and in English as follows:

> Remedial work in mathematics is defined as work in topics from arithmetic, beginning and intermediate algebra, plane geometry, and trigonometry. Trigonometry is considered remedial if taught as a separate course or taught in combination with more elementary subjects. A precalculus course, with intermediate algebra as a prerequisite, containing topics from advanced algebra, elementary functions (logarithmic, exponential, and trigonometric), and analytic geometry, is not considered remedial.
>
> Remedial work in English is defined as work designed primarily to enable students to satisfy the University Subject A requirement. Policy regarding credit for English as a Second Language will be determined by individual campuses.

Recommendation 11. That segments examine their policies and procedures to ensure that remedial coursework not granted baccalaureate degree credit by a four-year institution also not be identified as transfer credit by a two-year institution.

Response. It is University policy not to grant baccalaureate degree credit for courses taken at a two-year institution which would be considered remedial courses if taken at the University. The University's Board of Admission and Relations with Schools--the faculty committee responsible for admissions policies--has prepared the following guidelines for determining when baccalaureate credit may be given for college algebra courses:

> General Principle. A student may be given baccalaureate credit for at most four semester units or six quarter units for any combination of College Algebra or Precalculus courses.
>
> Intermediate Algebra. A course that places major emphasis on the topics listed below should be labelled intermediate algebra. Students do not receive any baccalaureate credit for such a course. The topics are exponents and radicals, polynomials and factoring, operations with rational expressions, linear equations and inequalities in one or two variable and their graphs, systems of two linear equations, and quadratic equations.
>
> College Algebra. A course that has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite and places major emphasis on the topics listed below should be labelled College Algebra. Students receive full baccalaureate credit for such a course. This course is not normally a prerequisite to the calculus or analytic geometry/calculus sequence. The topics are systems of linear equations, matrices and determinants, theory of (polynomial) equations, permutations, combinations, binomial theorem, mathematical induction, and introduction to probability.
>
> Precalculus. A course that has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite and places major emphasis on the topics listed below should be labelled Precalculus. Students receive full baccalaureate credit for such a course. The topics are advanced algebra, elementary functions (logarithmic, exponential, and trigonometric), and analytic geometry.

Until the University develops a Universitywide standard for Subject A that is useful to the community colleges for assessing the level of its courses, the Board recommends that all articulated composition courses have a prerequisite of some sort: either a prior composition course or passage of a standard examination. The Board strongly recommends that the examination include a composition component.

Recommendation 13. That the University of California, the California State University, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, and the State Board of Education examine by no later than January 15, 1984, the clientele, provision of services, and potential growth of English as a Second Language services as a preliminary step in the development of a coherent philosophy and practical strategy to meet both current and future need.

Response. A survey soliciting information on ESL programs in the University was sent to the campuses in Fall, 1984. A report on the findings of this survey has been drafted and sent to the campuses for review. A copy of this ESL report is included as supplementary material with this document. A follow-up questionnaire was sent to campuses recently and that information is now being compiled.

The University Committee on Undergraduate Preparatory and Remedial Education (UCUPRE) has appointed a Subcommittee on ESL. This Subcommittee is meeting during the academic year 1985-86 to review policy issues related to the University's ESL programs and to consider policy issues resulting from the ESL survey findings. Any policy recommendations resulting from this review will be forwarded to UCUPRE for consideration.

Recommendation 15. That all three segments, in the interest of improved articulation, explore with the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education the possibility of using appropriate postsecondary diagnostic tests so that high school students can be assured of consistent expectations between high schools and colleges and thus be encouraged to obtain the necessary skills before entering college.

Response. The State has provided funds through the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) to increase substantially the use of the mathematics diagnostic test for high school students. See Recommendation 4 above. CAPP has also provided funds for the expansion of two of the University's writing projects for eleventh-grade students. These two projects are being administered as joint pilot projects with CSU.

As indicated in the response to Recommendation 4 above, the University is in the process of developing a Universitywide Subject A examination to be used for measuring the writing proficiency of entering freshmen and for diagnosing the writing strengths and weaknesses of eleventh-grade students.

Recommendation 16. That each segment develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a rigorous program evaluation model for remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, using some common criteria and common vocabulary to ensure comparability across segments and report the implementation on their campuses in their 1985 report.

Response. Following an intersegmental evaluation conference sponsored by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the University held a Universitywide evaluation workshop in May, 1984 for directors of remedial English and mathematics programs to discuss evaluation procedures and needs. After this general workshop, a meeting for mathematics faculty only was held in April, 1985 specifically to discuss the use of placement examinations and evaluation requirements for remedial mathematics programs. Campuses are evaluating these remedial English and mathematics programs in various ways.

Berkeley: All courses at Berkeley are subject to Senate review by the Divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction and routinely evaluated according to departmental procedures. For example, Math P has been formally approved by the Committee on Courses, reviewed by the Mathematics Department, and is evaluated every term by students enrolled in the course. The Mathematics Department has also undertaken special studies of Math P and Math PS, including tracking students' later success in mathematics courses.

In addition, in-depth evaluations of remedial courses have been periodically conducted. For example, during 1984-85, Subject A was evaluated by a subcommittee of the Committee on Courses. Members of the subcommittee gathered data, interviewed faculty and staff members, examined course content and student work, and undertook other activities to assess the quality and merit of Subject A courses. As a result, they concluded that at Berkeley Subject A is very effective and should continue to receive 2 units credit toward the B.A. and an additional 2 units of workload credit.

Davis: The Composition Program has an extensive system of evaluation. Every student who is held for Subject A must take an exit exam which is comparable to the Subject A exam. This exam is graded by staff as a whole, not by individual instructors. In addition, the Subject A program is evaluated by a Senate Program Review committee. In 1984-85, the entire English Composition program, including Subject A, was reviewed by a team of outside evaluators. Finally, the Program director has conducted a study to evaluate the effectiveness of Subject A instruction by comparing the performance of Subject A students in advanced classes with those students who were exempted from Subject A. Subject A students on the average performed as well as other students.

The campus has recently completed a review of the ESL program and is designing a new program to accommodate students' needs. ESL students have been required to take the Subject A exam at the end of the ESL coursework.

Irvine: Under the direction of the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, a computer system is being developed which, among other things, will evaluate curriculum and provide advisors information on students' strengths and weaknesses. Plans for 1985-86 are to evaluate mathematics, including remedial programs, and academic support programs. Cost for evaluation of this nature is estimated to be around $10,000, not including personnel.

Los Angeles: Writing program administrators report that assessment of the program is continuous. Instructors and administrators meet regularly to compare and regulate standards, evaluate papers and discuss grading. These instructors also sit on various Writing Program committees charged with curriculum development, textbook review, staff enrichment and instructional evaluation. In addition, in 1984-85, an experimental one-time study of the freshmen English courses--English A, English 1 and English 3--was conducted. All students entering A, 1, or 3 in fall wrote on one of two assignments of the kind students could be expected to receive at the end of English 3. In any given class, half of the students wrote on assignment x, the other half on assignment y. When students completed English 3, they wrote on the assignment they did not write on at entrance. All assignments were collected, coded, and kept until the end of spring, 1985. During the summer, a sizable sub-sample was blind-graded. Via statistical analysis, the study showed significant improvement for the cohort. Analysis of data collected is continuing.

The mathematics department reports plans to develop an evaluation mechanism during 1985-86. Dr. Eva Baker (Director of the Center for Study of Evaluation at UCLA) has been asked to propose an evaluation model to the department. Costs are not yet known.

ESL programs at UCLA are evaluated in three distinct ways:

1) Cognitive impact of courses has been evaluated by means of a 1985 comparative gain study involving ESL-instructed students and non-ESL-instructed students. Pre-post measurement was done over one academic quarter, using the ESL proficiency exam (ESLPE) with 100 ESL students. Students placing into and enrolling in ESL courses showed significant gains above students who placed into but delayed enrollment in ESL courses. All students were enrolled in regular university courses. Of the five skills measured (i.e., listening comprehension, reading comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, and writing error detection), writing error detection, grammar, and reading comprehension were most successfully promoted by ESL instruction. Listening comprehension and vocabulary appeared to be promoted equally as well by regular (non-ESL) university instruction.

2) "Need-press" interaction analysis has been conducted on all ESL students in each academic quarter, beginning Spring, 1985. In this regular evaluative procedure a statistical analysis is done of the match between student-expressed need and student-expressed course emphasis for 19 ESL skills in all courses and all sections of the program. Disparities between expressed needs and emphasis provide fuel for curricular revision.

3) Regular student evaluation of course and teacher forms are completed at the end of each quarter. These are reviewed by teachers and administrators with an end to improve the quality of instruction.

Riverside: The remedial programs in writing are evaluated primarily by means of a system of tests, which the program director believes is the most meaningful method of evaluation. All students enrolled in the program (Basic Writing 1, Basic Writing 2A, or Basic Writing 2B) write a diagnostic essay, a mid-term, and a final examination designed to measure their progress. The tests have the same format and are evaluated by committees that exclude instructors who have worked in the classroom with the student being evaluated. Students must show that they can pass the test before they are allowed to pass the Basic

Writing (Subject A) requirement. Almost all students who are held for the Subject A requirement at admission satisfy the requirement by the end of their first year at UC Riverside.

Students in Mathematics 3 are given the Intermediate Algebra Diagnostic Examination as a pre-test and post-test. In the Spring of 1985 there was an average increase of 12.5 right answers on the examination between the pre-test and the post-test administration of the examination.

The campus administers a diagnostic placement examination to entering students. The test is the one developed jointly by the UC and CSU systems. Students are not required to follow the recommendations that result from their performance on the examination. The campus, however, follows up the performance of students who do and do not follow the recommendations based on the placement examination. Last year there were 42 students for whom Mathematics 3 was the appropriate first course and that was the course in which they enrolled. When these students went on to Mathematics 5, their average grade in Mathematics 5 was 2.12. Another 35 students were advised to enter Mathematics 3, but they ignored this recommendation and enrolled directly in Mathematics 5. Their average grade in Mathematics 5 was only 1.68, which suggests that Mathematics 3 is preparing students for Mathematics 5.

The ESL courses on the campus are offered by University Extension, which has developed a separate set of survey instruments for use with the ESL students as part of the evaluation process. The supervisors also observe directly the performance of the instructors in the program. This information is used to evaluate and modify the program.

San Diego: The Third College Composition Program has an extensive and on-going program of evaluation and has published a series of reports on its evaluation studies. For example, one report--part of a two-year study of writing in general education courses--analyzed writing assignments given freshmen in five courses: Communications 20, Literature and Society 21, 22, 23 and Music 5. The purpose was to evaluate the intellectual demands which the assignments made on students and to determine whether the assignments merely tested students or enabled them to participate in the disciplines they were studying. The evaluation studies in this series reflect an eclectic approach to evaluation. Different kinds of studies are designed each year in order to improve the program and demonstrate what students are learning.

For ESL and remedial mathematics, some tracking of students has been attempted, but funds for developing a computer system of evaluation (around $25,000) have not been available. Arrangements have been made this year for the

Santa Cruz: The mathematics department is conducting a pilot evaluation program in remedial mathematics this spring term, 1986, with a $1,500 grant from FIPSE through the California Postsecondary Education Commission. A report on the study will be made to CPEC after the study is completed in June. The campus hopes to implement a full-scale evaluation process for remedial instruction in mathematics in 1986-87. To do a comparable evaluation program for both mathematics and writing the campus estimates the cost would be $8,000 to pay for faculty time, evaluation design, research assistance and materials.

Recommendation 17. That the University of California, the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges report biennially by December 1 to the California Postsecondary Education Commission regarding each segment's progress on each of the applicable recommendations in this report. These reports shall commence in 1985; after the third such report, the Commission will determine if further reports are necessary.

Response. This progress report and its supplementary materials have been submitted by the University in response to recommendations in Promises To Keep.

Appendix B California State University Materials

February 19, 1986

[redacted]
The California Postsecondary Education
Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Director Callan:

Attached is a copy of the California State University's first biennial report on implementation of our Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity, 1985-1990. Prepared in response to a series of Commission recommendations published in Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities, the report includes a multitude of activities and projects to achieve our goals.

Preliminary data from our testing programs indicate that we are very close to achieving our first year goals for competency in mathematics and English for regularly admitted first-time freshmen. A final calculation of competency rates for the 1985-86 testing year will be available later this month and will be transmitted to the Commission.

If you have questions or need further information concerning this report, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Linda Bunnell Jones in this office (ATSS 635-5564).

Sincerely,

John M. Smart
Deputy Provost

JMS:cw

cc: Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
Dr. William E. Vandament
Dr. Linda Bunnell Jones
Mr. Kenneth A. Simms

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CSU PLAN TO REDUCE REMEDIAL ACTIVITY
1985-1990

A PROGRESS REPORT

January, 1986

Implementation of the CSU Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity

A Progress Report
1986

Introduction

In January 1983, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) published its report, Promises to Keep, Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities. Included in the report were a number of recommendations for reduction of remedial activity in the State's postsecondary institutions. These recommendations are described in Attachment A.

The most significant of these recommendations, was the call for development of a plan to reduce remedial activity.

After extensive consultation on the Plan at all levels of the CSU, including discussion by the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor transmitted to CPEC in January 1985, the CSU's Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity: 1985-1990. (See attachment B.) The Plan was developed by a systemwide Task Force chaired by President Ellis E. McCune of CSU, Hayward, over a 16-month period beginning in Fall 1983.

This report summarizes efforts of the past year to implement the plan to reduce remediation in the CSU at the system and campus levels and outlines plans for continued monitoring and reporting of progress toward system goals.

The CSU Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity is a blueprint for the significant reduction over a five-year period of the need for remedial assistance by regularly admitted first-time freshmen. The plan is divided into three parts.

The first part of the plan emphasizes improving student preparation for college through collaboration among CSU, the University of California and the public schools. Together with the CSU-administered California Academic Partnership Program, the activities are designed to obviate the need for remediation through improvement in basic skills before college entry. The programs underline the recognition by CSU that the key to the Plan's success rests in the improvement of secondary education.

The second part explores the possibility of cooperative arrangements between CSU campuses and Community Colleges and adult schools for providing remedial instruction. The potential value of such relationships is discussed candidly as are the special circumstances necessary for success. While such cooperation may reduce remedial coursework at the four-year institutions, the approach merely shifts the remedial burden rather than attacking its basic causes.

Finally, CSU established goals for the reduction in the need for remedial activity by regularly admitted first-time freshmen. The goals are defined as improvement of success rates by students taking the CSU English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination. The expectations are that such rates will improve over the next five years to the point that 92% of the target group will be competent in math; 88% will be competent in English. The goals assume that present compliance rates with test policies and levels of test difficulty will remain constant.

Implicit in the design of the CSU's Plan is the recognition of the need both to maintain access to the University for California's citizens and to increase the presence of students from underrepresented groups in the CSU, while working to improve the quality of preparation and instruction. There is the clear assumption that basic skills development will continue to be available to students with the need for such services, especially those admitted by special action and returning adults.

Maintenance of access has been and remains a major public policy priority of the Board of Trustees. Along with establishing the goals in the Plan, the CSU has reiterated its intent to redouble efforts to recruit, enroll, and graduate growing numbers of underrepresented students.

Implementation - January 1985 to the Present

Since January 1985 the CSU has taken the following steps outlined at the systemwide level.

1. Increasing Admissions Requirements

   At their January 1986 meeting, the Board of Trustees amended Title 5 to phase-in additional subject matter requirements for admissions to the CSU. (See Attachment C.) The requirement will become fully effective for students enrolling in Fall Term 1988 and thereafter. The intent of the new requirements is to ensure adequate college preparatory coursework for incoming freshmen. It includes provision for conditional admission of students who lack a proportion of courses required. A special policy to accommodate such cases is being developed by the CSU Admissions Advisory Council to be presented to the Board of Trustees in May 1986.

2. Joint Review of College Preparatory Coursework

   The CSU has invited the University of California to join us in reviewing the lists of courses high schools describe as college preparatory. Such reviews would be conducted by joint faculty committees in all college preparatory subject matter areas. We have proposed to begin by reviewing the English courses certified by high schools.

   The UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has declined to join with CSU in such a review at this time, preferring to handle the matter through the high school accreditation process.

3. Expansion of Diagnostic Testing Activities

   In the past year a major expansion in diagnostic testing activities in the high schools has occurred. Through funding provided by the CSU-administered California Academic Partnership Program, more than 170,000 high school students have received diagnosis of their mathematics skills. Students, teachers and parents learn areas of strength and weakness so that they can plan future coursework and improved curricula.

Additionally, a diagnostic test of writing in high schools has been developed jointly by UC-CSU and pilot tested with some 1,200 students in Northern and Southern California. A new phase of the program is planned for 1986/87.

These diagnostic testing and scoring services are being made available at no cost to schools or students.

4. Testing Students in Basic Skills as a Condition of Admission

Strong consideration was given this year to including a Program Change Proposal to test prospective students in the English Placement Test and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination. It is clear that a positive effect of a pre-admission testing requirement would be to ensure student compliance with test requirements, thereby easing administration of the programs. However, the value of such a policy in actually improving student preparation would be limited. Therefore, to conserve scarce resources for use in programs directly assisting students, we are not seeking the funds to support pre-admission testing at this time.

5. Expansion of Academic Performance Reports

In November 1985, the CSU sent to each California school district superintendent, each high school principal, each English department chair, each mathematics department chair, and each high school head counselor an expanded report of performance by their students who entered CSU in Fall 1984 and reenrolled in Spring Term 1985. (See Attachment D.)

The report describes student enrollment, continuation rates, grade point averages, and SAT/ACT scores by campus, as well as systemwide performance on entry-level English and mathematics tests. In future reports data on performance in freshman English and mathematics courses will be included.

The information provides high schools the opportunity to compare performance by their students with that of all first-time freshmen at all CSU campuses. Each California high school which enrolled five or more first-time freshmen as regular or special admits has received a report for 1984-85.

6. Encourage Development of Junior and Senior High School Curricular Frameworks and Text Selection for College Preparatory Courses.

   The CSU has actively supported intersegmental efforts to develop statements of competency in English, mathematics, social science, natural science, and foreign language. We are also working closely with the State Department of Education on articulation of high school requirements with admission requirements to the university. One project which is designed to achieve this end is described in 7 below. We have not yet been able, however, to mount an initiative which concentrates directly on developing such frameworks to the exclusion of related activities.

7. Increase Opportunities for Secondary School Faculty to Improve their Understanding of and Ability to Teach College Preparatory Courses Beginning Fall 1986.

   The California State University and the State Department of Education jointly developed a major budget proposal for the year 1986-87. Among the proposal's components was the Faculty-to-Faculty Program--proposed to mount major partnership programs for faculty and curriculum development between eight selected CSU campus and high-minority high schools in their service areas. Included in the proposed program was provision for close collaboration on developing college preparatory coursework and teaching strategies. Unfortunately, funding for this item was not included in the Governor's Budget for 1986-87.

We are cooperating with the University of California in a consideration of expansion of the California Writing Project for 1987/88. This program which operates on ten campuses offers summer institutes to teachers to improve instruction in writing. (See page 12 for details).

8. Improvement in Pre-Service Teacher Education

A cornerstone of the program to improve student preparation has been the program to improve the training of California teachers. The CSU, as the foremost teacher training institution in California, has undertaken major initiatives to improve teacher education.

In May 1985, the Trustees approved minimum entry and exit requirements for CSU teacher education programs which go well beyond State credential requirements. (See Attachment E.) Among these requirements are the following:

a. For admission

1) maintenance of a grade-point average at least equal to the median grade point average for undergraduates on the campus classified by discipline;

2) early field experience that includes observation and participation in public school activities;

3) evaluation of professional aptitude through interviews, reviews of letters of recommendation and statements written by the applicant;

4) maintenance of physical fitness standards conforming with those of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing;

5) evaluation of fundamental skills in written and spoken English, reading, and mathematics (passage of CBEST required for admission to the program is required on 15 campuses)

   6) evaluation of personality and character traits in terms of professional standards.

b. After admission

   1) continuation in the program based on continued meeting of admissions requirements or conditions established at admission;

   2) establishment of requirements for admission to student teaching, including a minimum 3.0 g.p.a. in classes attempted after admission, certification of subject matter competence, satisfaction of statutory requirements, and of exceptional admission conditional requirements;

   3) establishment of requirements for recommendation for a credential, including maintenance of a 3.0 g.p.a. after admission to the credential program, satisfactory completion of student teaching and statutory requirements; demonstration of fundamental skills and subject matter competence; satisfactory demonstration of instructional performance, classroom management and professional attitudes.

In addition, a $4.4 million program was funded to improve the clinical supervision of student teachers. CSU campuses have implemented this project based on systemwide guidelines. (See Attachment F.)

The CSU has recently also completed a task force report on the training of teachers in mathematics and sciences. The reports contain recommendations covering the following areas:

1) Attracting students of mathematics and the sciences to careers in teaching;

2) Preparing mathematics and science teachers for the elementary schools (K-6);

3) Preparing mathematics and science teachers for grades 7 through 12;

4) Upgrading skills of teachers trained in other subjects;

5) Professional development for fully certified mathematics and science teachers.

Campuses have been urged to reexamine their credential waiver curricula and to incorporate strong mathematics and English skills training in their programs. Moves have been especially strong to reinforce basic skills in the Liberal Studies curriculum for elementary teachers.

Teacher education is seen increasingly as an all-campus responsibility. Command of subject matter knowledge through closer association of major programs with credential programs is an increasing priority.

Campus Programs to Reduce Remediation

In Fall 1985 the CSU conducted a survey of campuses to inventory local activities in support of the remediation Plan. (See Attachment G.) Responses indicate that a wide array of activities is underway on our campuses in support of the systemwide Plan. Many of these pre-date the Plan's development. We classify these efforts into the following areas:

1) High School Partnerships

The majority of CSU campuses have participated in partnership activities with high schools in their service areas. These activities are designed to include a wide variety of projects to improve student/teacher skills, to develop the college preparatory curriculum, and to improve the representation of minorities in the CSU student body. Following are some examples:

-- CSC, Bakersfield has entered into a partnership with the Kern High School District to increase the number of graduates eligible for CSU. In cooperation with

American College Testing, the ACT is administered in the high schools; counselors are to be assisted in diagnosis of student skills; a summer bridge program is to be run for potential college-bound students; and the campus will assist KHSD to offer a senior tutorial in mathematics and English. The campus also has participated in a Junior MESA program as part of the California Academic Partnership Program.

-- CSU, Dominguez Hills has received a $114,000 grant from the State Department of Education for installation, implementation and evaluation of a computer-based education lab at Carson High School. Students completing learning contracts in this program can earn admission to a job internship at Northrop or at one of the other participating companies.

-- CSU, Fresno is currently exploring partnerships with local high schools through their Learning Assistance Center.

-- At CSU, Fullerton, the mathematics department is offering a section of first-year calculus at a local high school. Through Project ACCESS, the campus also offers a summer science and mathematics enrichment program for high school juniors.

-- CSU, Hayward conducts a partnership with Castlemont High School in Oakland which includes staff development for English faculty and guest speakers for honors students. They also work with Newark Memorial High School on staff and curriculum development in science.

-- Humboldt State University has had an Academic Program Improvement grant which allowed four campus English faculty to work with Eureka high school in designing and offering college preparatory English programs.

-- CSU, Long Beach has entered into partnerships with area school districts through their Schools of Natural Science, Humanities, Engineering, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Education and through the Mathematics Department. Participating districts include Compton and Los Angeles Unified and Los Angeles County Schools. Activities include staff

- development, curricular development, and skill-building for high school students.

- CSU, Los Angeles has entered into partnerships with Dorsey, Bell, Bell Gardens and Montebello to train faculty in the teaching of composition. They also participate in a project with Crenshaw High School whose goal is to encourage minority students to become teachers.

- CSU, Northridge's work with high schools includes an Academic Program Improvement grant for Math/Sciences/English/Social Studies teaching and academic enrichment projects for students. Another project has CSUN students as teaching assistants at Cleveland High School. Additionally, a project was conducted at area high schools in 1984 to develop a mathematics course for the underprepared. Finally, the campus has participated in a CAPP partnership with local high schools using Learning from Text reading techniques.

- CSPU, Pomona sponsors summer programs in science for minority students and is engaged in a mathematics partnership with the Walnut Valley Unified School District, and through a CAPP grant with Whittier Unified School District.

- CSU, Sacramento is currently participating in a CAPP project for improvement in mathematics and in a program to teach critical thinking skills through ethnic literature.

- CSU, San Bernardino is involved in an "adopt-a-school" program in concert with Cajon High School. The Mathematics Department has been particularly active in promoting close relationships among secondary and college math faculty and has sponsored in-service activities for high school teachers. Other activities include a study skills project with local schools; "Project Upbeat," an enrichment program for gifted and talented junior high school students; in-service activities for history teachers; a critical thinking workshop with Riverside County Schools; and the appointment of a High School-University Program Coordinator.

-- San Jose State University has established an all-campus task force on remediation, has improved campus performance reports to high schools and is coordinating with the College Board a project to increase enrollment in Advanced Placement Courses, to increase numbers of students taking the PSAT, and to increase numbers of students taking AP tests.

-- San Francisco State University has been engaged for a number of years in the Learning Bridge program with Balboa High School in San Francisco. This project, supported by systemwide Academic Program Improvement funds joins faculty from SFSU with Balboa High School teachers in English, Social Science, Mathematics, Education, Ethnic Studies, Humanities and Science to develop curricular materials and teaching strategies. The goal has been to increase the number of Balboa graduates who enroll in the community colleges and at San Francisco State. In addition the campus operates staff development projects for mathematics and science teachers through the School of Education; a peer resource center at Galileo High School for career and academic planning; curriculum development projects in mathematics; and coursework in composition for secondary education students.

-- At San Diego State University, the campus operates a cooperative Writing Program with San Diego Unified School District to develop faculty expertise in writing across the curriculum. The campus also participates in a National Science Foundation-CSU-SDUSD-funded project to improve high school science teaching. The campus also has established an "adopt-a-school" program with Granger Junior High School to promote the orientation of minority students to college study.

-- CPSU, San Luis Obispo has sponsored a mathematics diagnostic testing conference for local teachers and a "Science Day" for teachers and students.

-- Sonoma State University is pursuing an Honors/College Preparatory partnership with the Petaluma School District and is providing SAT testing and off-campus instruction for Mendocino County Schools in Ukiah. The campus also participates with the Geyersville

School District in partnership activities with high school English, foreign language, natural science and mathematics teachers. Additionally, the Chemistry Department meets with high school chemistry teachers to discuss curricular concerns. Finally, Sonoma State has sponsored the West Coast Energy Development Institute during the summer for high school teachers under a grant from private industry and the National Science Foundation.

-- CSU, Stanislaus faculty are working with high school teachers, the County Schools office and a district curriculum development specialist to integrate history, economics and social science classes into a high school social science curriculum to be made available to area high schools.

The above-cited list is not exhaustive. The California State University also participates in two very important statewide staff development programs. The California Writing Project (CWP) is conducted on ten CSU campuses (Bakersfield, Chico, Fresno, Humboldt, Long Beach, Northridge, San Bernardino, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma). The CWP offers Summer institutes and in-service activities during the academic year to improve the abilities of high school teachers in teaching writing. The California Mathematics Project operates programs at nine CSU campuses (Chico, Dominguez Hills, Humboldt, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, Stanislaus) and performs a similar function in mathematics.

Such "traditional" programs as Student Outreach Services, MESA, Student Affirmative Action, and relations with schools offices are operated on all campuses to promote preparation for the high school-college transition.

An additional very important program deserves mention--The California Academic Partnership Program. This intersegmental program provides funding for partnerships between or among CSU, UC, the Community Colleges and secondary education for improving the preparation of students (especially underrepresented students) for college. At present, nine CSU campuses are participating in CAPP grant activities. They are Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Hayward, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego and Sonoma. (See Attachment H).

In a related activity, The CSU is collaborating with the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in establishing a Southern Service Center of the Laboratory. The Center will pursue activities in the West, - primarily in Southern California - designed 1) to prepare students in the region for adult success, 2) to advance promising models for schooling and learning, and 3) to enhance teacher quality and support for school-based improvement. The center will be located at CSU, Northridge. A major emphasis of the program will be to improve the educational achievement of minority students.

2. Cooperative Arrangements With Community Colleges and Adult Schools

Seven CSU campuses are either conducting or plan to conduct cooperative arrangements with community colleges or adult schools. Campuses at Chico, Long Beach, Northridge, San Diego and San Luis Obispo are offering English, mathematics or both in conjunction with the area community college. Several other campuses are exploring the possibility. Fullerton will begin an arrangement with Fullerton College in Fall 1986. Bakersfield foresees eventual adult school involvement in college remediation.

The CSU has issued guidelines for administration of these programs, if the CSU and community college campus wish to enter such arrangements. The guidelines include provision for ensuring adequate coordination of the budgetary requirements of both institutions, for maintenance of course comparability, and for evaluation of remedial programs. (See Attachment I.)

3. Teacher Preparation

In addition to participating in the systemwide policy on admission and exit requirements and in the clinical supervision project, CSU campuses have instituted a number of projects to improve teacher preparation.

Foremost among these changes has been the revision of curricula in both elementary and secondary credential programs. Several campuses have paid particular attention to mandatory mathematics and composition courses to and certification of subject matter knowledge for Single and Multiple Subject credential candidates. For example, the Fresno and Fullerton campuses have added mandatory coursework in mathematics in either Multiple Subject only (Fresno) programs, or for both Multiple and Single Subject candidates (Fullerton). Hayward has instituted an upper division English composition course for Multiple Subject candidates, and an upper division mathematics course for all elementary and middle school teacher candidates. At San Bernardino, the English Department has introduced a new methods course in teaching at the high school level. At Sonoma, a subject minor has been added for Liberal Studies majors.

New graduate degrees are being developed in the teaching of English, mathematics and science. "Civic Education" is stressed on several campuses to provide law-related education for future teachers. Schools of Education are adding tenure-track faculty to their staffs to meet increased demand.

Enrollment in CSU teacher education programs has increased 18 % in the past year.

4. Diagnostic Testing

A number of CSU campuses use the UC/CSU Math Diagnostic Testing Series at the campus or secondary level or both. Presently six CSU campuses serve as service centers for the distribution and scoring of the Math Diagnostic Test Series at area high schools and for consultation with school personnel on the nature, purpose and use of the test. These campuses are: CSU, Los Angeles; CSU, Sacramento; CPSU, San Luis Obispo; CSU, Chico; CSU, Fresno; and CSU, Fullerton.

The Sacramento and Northridge campuses have worked with their UC neighbors, Davis and UCLA, to develop a diagnostic test of writing for high school students. Now beyond the pilot-test stage, this testing is being expanded in 1985-86 under the aegis of the California Academic Partnership Program.

In addition to these two tests, campuses have used a variety of diagnostic instruments to place students. the Educational Opportunity Program and campus learning assistance centers have been prime users of such instruments to test and remediate deficiencies as quickly as possible. These tools include the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, California Study Methods Survey, and locally developed mathematics and English competency tests.

Bakersfield, Northridge, and Dominguez Hills have administered the CSU English Placement Test (EPT) and/or the Entry-Level Mathematics (ELM) Test at the high-school level. A pilot project to administer ELM at the community college level has also been conducted at Butte College, Long Beach City College, and at several campuses in the Los Angeles Community College District.

5. Innovative Remedial Programs

Foremost among the innovative remedial efforts undertaken by the CSU are the Summer Bridge and Intensive Learning Experience (ILE) programs. As key components of the systemwide Educational Equity Program, the projects are designed to remedy skill deficiencies of admitted students quickly and effectively and to enable students to persist through to their educational goals.

The programs represent important system efforts to preserve and increase access for underrepresented students while working toward improving preparation by all students. In 1985-86 seventeen campuses are operating intensive learning programs. Nineteen conducted Summer Bridge programs in Summer 1985.

Several campuses have offered for some time self-paced or modular programs designed for quick, efficient and cost-effective skill mastery. Notable in this regard are the remedial mathematics programs at Dominguez Hills, Humboldt and Northridge. Others maintain math and writing skills workshops and tutorials through EOP and the Learning Assistance Center. San Francisco State maintains a Center for Mathematics Literacy and conducts EPT/ELM and graduation writing examination workshops. Evaluations of several of these programs attest to their effectiveness.

6. Research and Evaluation of Effective Remediation

Several campuses have undertaken research into the effectiveness of their remedial programs. The Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, Hayward, Los Angeles, Northridge, and San Bernardino campuses have undertaken substantial studies of their math and English remediation.

Additionally, under a CPEC-funded project, the San Diego and Northridge campuses are pilot testing a proposed set of guidelines to be applied systemwide in evaluating remedial programs.

In 1985-86, the CSU has funded campus-based evaluations of the EPT and writing skills remediation programs on eleven campuses. Additionally, a contract has just been completed for an external evaluation of EPT/Writing Skills programs on three selected campuses. (See details on page 17).

In connection with the Summer Bridge/Intensive Learning Experience Programs, CSU has reviewed proposals from seven firms for a comprehensive evaluation of both programs. The contract will cover the first three years of the program and will test a series of assumptions about the projects.

7. Goal Setting for Reduction of Remediation

The vast majority of CSU campuses have not set individual goals for reduction of remediation. Most look to the central office for goal setting and monitoring. In 1985-86, the goal set in our Plan is that 48% of regularly admitted first-time freshmen taking the EPT will demonstrate competency. The ELM figure is projected at 58%.

1985-86 figures will not be available until analysis of final test results in February. We will report these figures at that time. However, 1984-85 figures are most encouraging. In the 1984-85 testing year (May through January), 49% of test takers in the target group demonstrated competency on EPT compared to the goal of 48%; the ELM competency rate was 56% compared to the goal of 58%.

Since The Plan was submitted, we have found that a higher percentage of students (31% instead of the assumed 20%) are exempt from the ELM through SAT/ACT and other standardized test performance. Although goals concentrate only on test takers, there is an indication that the proportion of students competent in mathematics is higher than anticipated.

Other CPEC Recommendations

Although implementation of Recommendation 1 has been of special importance, specific activities addressing recommendations 2, 3, 5, 16, and 17 have also been undertaken.

Recommendation 2 (Promises to Keep, Page 102): This recommendation calls on the CSU to continue to make remediation available "to the degree dictated by the needs of incoming students as determined by appropriate assessment." Further, the CSU is to examine its programs to ensure maximum quality, responsiveness to student need, lowest costs, and least duplication.

Since 1984, the CSU has instituted major assessment activities in the areas of English and mathematics remediation.

The first of these activities was an evaluation project covering the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination and the remediation which is provided to students with deficiencies in basic mathematics skills. Project reports have provided useful information on the testing process and expectations for testing remediation program outcomes. (See Attachment J)

Secondly, as mentioned briefly under campus responses, in 1985-86 the CSU is involved in many and diverse projects to evaluate the English Placement Test and remedial Student Writing Skills programs. These activities are coordinated by the systemwide EPT Evaluation Committee. The following evaluations currently are underway:

a. A report and recommendations on campus practices relative to the EPT/Writing Skills programs on all 19 campuses. The CSU systemwide English consultant has just visited all nineteen CSU campuses to gather information. The visits are a follow-up to a systemwide survey of campus practices carried out via questionnaire in Spring 1985.

b. The CSU has received State funds to offer campuses the opportunity to conduct on-campus evaluations of EPT/Writing Skills Operations. Currently eleven project proposals have been funded. Reports on completed projects will be submitted by June 30, 1986.

c. The CSU has recently awarded a contract to the Evaluation and Training Institute of Los Angeles to conduct in-depth external evaluations of EPT/Writing Skills programs on the Long Beach, Hayward and Stanislaus campuses. The campuses were selected as representing differing geographic areas and service area populations.

Finally, the CSU is offering intensive remediation in English and mathematics under the Intensive Learning Experience and Summer Bridge programs funded for a three-year initial period by the Legislature. Each campus program proposal must include a complete plan to evaluate the achievement of program goals. Within the next two weeks, we will award a major, three-year contract to an external organization to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs over their first three-year segment and to aid campuses in designing their own internal evaluations.

In pursuing these projects, we hope to ensure that our remedial programs are useful, effective and cost-effective.

Recommendation 3 (Promises to Keep, p. 102): This recommendation calls for the CSU to explore cooperative arrangements with community colleges and adult schools for the offering of remediation. The system response has been discussed as part of the Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity. (p. 25)

Recommendation 4 (Promises to Keep, p. 102): This recommendation calls on the CSU to assist schools in defining college preparatory courses, in providing staff development activities and to continue monitoring preparation of students through diagnostic testing and performance reporting to high schools, the State Department of Education and CPEC.

In the remediation Plan, the measurement of the decline in the need for remediation is to be accomplished through our entry-level English and mathematics tests. As discussed in the Plan, a greatly expanded report to high schools on student performance on the tests and including other important data has been produced and sent to high school administrators, counselors and faculty.

Our invitation for joint review of college preparatory courses lists has not yet been accepted. However, we have issued "definition and designation" statements for college preparatory mathematics and English courses for use by high schools. (See Attachments K and L.)

Recommendation 16 (Promises to Keep, p. 110): This recommendation calls for the development of a rigorous program evaluation model by CSU for its remedial programs. Such a model was developed by a subcommittee of the Remediation Task Force in early 1985. In Fall 1985 the model was pilot tested on two CSU campuses (Northridge, and San Diego). Reports of the projects are pending. The CPEC-appointed external evaluator is currently visiting the sites to offer advice and to assess the usefulness of the model.

After the pilot test, the model will be modified as appropriate and circulated to campuses for comment. Thereafter, the final version will be incorporated as part of a system policy on evaluation of remedial programs.

Recommendation 17 (Promises to Keep, p. 110): This recommendation refers to the necessary biennial report to CPEC. This report embodies both that obligation and our commitment to report annually to the Board of Trustees.

Eligibility Index Change

Meeting the goals for reduction of remediation in subsequent years will be complicated by a recent change in the CSU admission eligibility index. The goals were set substantially higher than those for 1985/86 because it was assumed that reforms in secondary schools would require some time to have impact on students. Meeting goals for 1986/87 may be somewhat more difficult than anticipated because eligibility requirements (SAT/ACT scores and grade point averages) were revised downward in 1985 to assure regular admission to the top 33 1/3% of California High School graduates, rather than the 29% yielded by the earlier index requirements. It may be that the additional numbers of students admitted under these revised eligibility requirements will be more in need of remedial assistance and that previous calculations about goals will have to be reviewed under the new circumstances and, if necessary, revised downwards.

Future Activities

The CSU will continue to monitor closely its achievement of goals as outlined in the Plan to Reduce Remedial Activity. We will also continue to report annually to CPEC enrollment in remedial coursework in the CSU. Our third such report will be based on data and information from the campuses due in this office by February 3, 1986.

We anticipate that the many evaluation projects underway and completed will have a major impact on the way in which remediation is offered in The California State University. We will continue to report on modifications made as a result of this complex process and to seek approval of the Board for recommendations to modify Trustee policy in this area.

Attachment A

CPEC Recommendations* Regarding Remediation in the California State University

1. That the University of California and the California State University each develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a plan whose goal is to reduce remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language within a five-year period to a level consonant with the principles of both quality and access as determined by each segment. In developing such plans, the segments should take into account the anticipated effects of increased admissions requirements and the steps taken by the high schools to improve student preparation. These plans shall be transmitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for review and comment.

2. That the University of California and the California State University in the interim continue to offer or make available remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language to the degree dictated by the needs of incoming students as determined by appropriate assessment. In the interest of better coordination and integration, each segment should examine the means by which its campuses offer remediation in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, in order to ensure maximum quality, responsiveness to student need, lowest cost, and least duplication.

3. That the University of California and the California State University explore cooperative arrangements with institutions such as Community Colleges and K-12 adult schools to provide remedial activities in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language.

*Numbers are as they appear in the CPEC Report, Promises to Keep

4. That the University of California and the California State University assist the high schools in defining the standards for college-preparatory courses and in providing staff development through activities like, but not limited to, the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project. That the University and the State University continue to monitor the preparation of incoming students from feeder high schools through entry-level diagnostic testing in all basic skills areas and report such data to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

16. That each segment develop by no later than March 1, 1984, a rigorous program evaluation model for remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language, using some common criteria and common vocabulary to ensure comparability across segments.

17. That the University of California, the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges report biennially by December 1 to the California Postsecondary Education Commission regarding each segment's progress on each of the applicable recommendations in this report. These reports shall commence in 1985; after the third such report, the Commission will determine if further reports are necessary.

It was agreed with CPEC Staff that consideration of instruction in English as a Second Language would be handled separately.

Appendix C California Community College Materials

April 2, 1986

Kenneth O'Brien
Assistant Director
California Postsecondary Education
  Commission
1020 Twelfth Street, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ken:

Enclosed, please find the report of the California Community Colleges on the progress made in responding to recommendations from Promises to Keep.

As you know, the period from the publication of Promises to the present has been one during which the Board and the Chancellery have made extensive headway in developing coherent segmental and intersegmental policy concerning remediation, much of which goes well beyond the recommendations from Promises. The attached reports list many of these efforts as they relate to the specific recommendation language.

We hope you will find the report useful.

Sincerely,

Laura Faulk Willson
by [illegible]

Laura Faulk Willson
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

cc: Gus Guichard
    Joan Sallee

BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROMISES TO KEEP

February 1986

In April 1983, shortly after the publication of Promises to Keep, former Chancellor Gerald Hayward appointed a Task Force on Academic Quality and charged it to deliberate and make recommendations concerning a wide range of "educational quality issues," including the full range of issues raised in Promises concerning remediation. After reviewing and commenting on a number of progress reports from the Task Force during 1984 and 1985, the Board, in May 1985, approved the recommendations in a comprehensive agenda item on remediation policy which included responses to the recommendations in Promises. Subsequently, the Commission to Review the Master Plan undertook deliberation of remediation issues; and in December 1985, Chancellor Joshua Smith reviewed with the Board its existing policies, proposed refinements in some areas and offered an alternative to the Board's earlier response to the Promises recommendation to implement an "academic skills floor." As a result of that review, the Board adopted a major policy resolution concerning remediation, which also directed staff to begin a consultation process with the colleges to develop specific implementation proposals for that policy resolution. Following is a reprint of the set of four recommendations which are the subject of that consultation process adopted by the Board:

> Recommendation 1: Community colleges should continue to be regarded in state policy as the primary postsecondary providers of remedial instruction and services in a setting where:
>
> a) the remedial instruction offered is designed solely for the purpose of raising students' language and computational skills to the levels required for success in college degree and certificate courses;
>
> b) there is mandatory assessment of students' skills at entrance;
>
> c) there is placement in degree- and certificate-level courses, based upon prerequisite skill levels required for success;
>
> d) there are adequate resources to monitor student progress and provide necessary follow-up support services; and
>
> e) there is opportunity for concurrent enrollment in remedial courses and non-remedial courses which do not have prerequisite skill requirements.
>
> Recommendation 2:
>
> Option A: Students who do not initially meet skill prerequisite standards for degree-applicable college courses may accumulate up to a maximum of 30 semester units (45 quarter units)

of non-degree applicable credit in remedial courses to meet the standard. Students who fail to meet this satisfactory progress standard will be dismissed, with referral to continued remediation in adult schools when appropriate.

Option B: Amend "Standards of Scholarship" regulations (Title 5, Chapter 9, Sections 55754-55756) and any other necessary regulations to make more rigorous the probation and dismissal standards for students enrolled in all courses, including remediation. Specifically: 1) require that students who have attempted at least 12 semester units or 18 quarter units shall be placed on probation if the student has earned a cumulative grade point average below 2.0 and/or has failed to complete more than 50% of the units attempted; and 2) require that students on probation be dismissed if they failed to earn a grade point average of 2.0 in each of two consecutive semesters (three quarters) and/or fail to complete at least 75% of the units attempted in each of two consecutive semesters (three quarters). *Full development of this policy should include stronger dismissal and return policies and regulations.*

Recommendation 3: Community colleges should provide for the full range of remedial instruction needed to correct the skill deficiencies exhibited by students who enroll *with an intent to take certificate or degree courses.* They may, *by a formalized mutual agreement process, contract with adult schools to provide* some part of the remediation program. The mutual agreement/contract process would require formal articulation of curricula and standards of course conduct to insure a smooth student flow between segments. Under either of the options in Recommendation 2, units attempted in the articulated adult school courses would be included in calculating probation and dismissal standards.

Recommendation 4: The Board should reiterate its earlier call for a joint, comparative study of remediation that is offered in the credit mode in community colleges and remediation that is offered in adult, noncredit programs under the auspices of high school and community college districts. The study should consider both the effectiveness of the courses and the purposes or objectives for which they are taught. It should offer recommendations concerning the proper delineation of the roles of non-degree applicable credit remediation and noncredit remediation, taking into consideration such other policy issues as the role of financial aid eligibility requirements and the importance of related student support services.

The consultation process required by the Board is presently underway. Support documents for this process are included in Appendix B of this document. Thus, the Chancellery and the Board of Governors have deliberated and acted upon all of the original recommendations in *Promises* and, in fact, in many cases have gone beyond the recommendations in shaping coherent policy for the community colleges regarding remediation. Responses to specific relevant recommendations are set out below in numerical order as they appeared in Promises. Reports and agenda items mentioned here are provided in Appendix A of this document.

Recommendation 5: That the California Community Colleges continue to be considered in the long term as the primary postsecondary provider of remedial courses and services in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language in the State in addition to their academic, vocational, and community service functions.

Recommendation #1 in the December 1985 Board-adopted consultation policy above parallels the language proposed in Recommendation #5 of Promises and further expands on the criteria for its application for community colleges. These criteria are designed to ensure that the attendent educational and fiscal support mechanisms are described clearly as the necessary vehicles to implement a policy wherein community colleges become the primary providers of postsecondary remedial instruction.

Recommendation 6: That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges establish an academic floor below which instruction would not be offered. That they redirect students below this level to the adult basic education program operated either by the local community college or school district. A reasonable period of time should be allowed before this floor is instituted.

In May 1985, the Board took the position that the feasibility of the "academic floor" proposal needed further study, including the opportunities to first implement assessment/placement processes in a sample of colleges and to test model evaluation processes for remediation in those colleges. In December 1985, the Board reiterated its intention to improve evaluation of remedial instruction, but also adopted a policy resolution which stated: 1) that colleges should provide the full range of remedial instruction to meet the needs of their admitted students; 2) that that "range" could be provided either through their own auspices, or jointly under formal articulation arrangements with high school adult programs; and 3) that a limit should be placed on the amount of remediation a given student can take to become eligible for degree and certificate courses, either by setting a maximum of 30 semester units or by creating more rigorous academic progress and dismissal standards or by some combination of the two. Staff is currently conducting a comprehensive consultation process with the colleges to develop specific implementation standards. It is expected that the Board will adopt such standards in July or September of 1986.

Recommendation 7: That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges take steps to ensure that all Community College Districts establish comprehensive assessment/placement, advising, and follow-up programs to ensure adequate progress of remedial students. (Also see Recommendation 14.)

In April 1984, the Board adopted Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation. In that year, a bill that would have initiated a phase-in of matriculation was vetoed by the Governor. In 1985, the Board unsuccessfully requested matriculation funding in the Budget to implement assessment, placement and follow-up services in all colleges. In addition, two separate funding bills were introduced in the Legislature and were carried over to the current session. In Fall 1985, the Board again unsuccessfully requested Budget funding. In the meantime, the Commission to Review the Master Plan has recommended that funding to implement matriculation in Fall 1986 be provided in the Budget. The Board will continue to support that recommendation and, if funded, will begin the process to implement the matriculation plan statewide.

Recommendation 8: That the Community College districts enter into delineation of function agreements with feeder high school/districts within their boundaries regarding preparatory activities and courses in reading, writing, mathematics, and English-As-A-Second Language; such agreements may include cooperative arrangements for serving underprepared adults. The articulation agreements shall be transmitted to the Board of Governors.

Recommendation 9: That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges work with the University of California and the California State University to assist high schools in defining the standards for college-preparatory courses and in providing staff development through activities like, but not limited to, the California Writing Project and the California Mathematics Project. That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges encourage the Community College districts to monitor the preparation of incoming students from feeder high schools through entry-level diagnostic testing in all basic skills areas and report such data to local boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. (Also see Recommendation 4.)

The Academic Senate, California Community Colleges, with encouragement of the Board and in cooperation with the faculties of the other segments, has developed and disseminated "competency expectation statements" in English and mathematics and is developing similar statements in other discipline areas. In March 1986, the Chancellor created a new "Unit of Academic Standards and Basic Skills" within the Chancellery. The primary purpose for this unit will be to coordinate the development and establishment of statewide standards in the basic skills areas of reading, writing, mathematics and English-As-A-Second Language. It is expected that this new unit will review and adopt/adapt, as appropriate, existing standards such as those developed by the Academic Senate.

It is important to note that there have been other pertinent activities in this area of high school/community college interaction including the following:

Academic Preparation and Articulation Program with High Schools -- A budget augmentation request was submitted by the Chancellery to support and promote articulation and academic partnerships with high schools. If funded, this program would be patterned after the "2+2" model already proven successful in a number of community college/high school partnerships. The primary objective of this program would be to ensure the smooth transition of high school students to community college and subsequently to four-year colleges and universities. This interactive activity would eliminate the duplication and repetition of coursework streamlining the students' educational program and rapid completion of vocational/occupational or transfer program.

Student Performance Reports -- Currently, the State University and University of California both provide reports to high schools and community colleges about the academic performance of their graduates. In order to make the information on these reports more useful, the Chancellery conducted a recent survey of college presidents, instructional officers and academic senate presidents, asking those individuals about the usefulness of the current report format. On January 27, 1986, a Community College Ad Hoc Task Group was convened to review the survey results and develop recommendations for the improvement of the reports. Subsequently, a small working committee, including CSU and UC representatives met and developed a set of recommendations. The preliminary draft of their work is included in Appendix C.

The California Articulation Number (CAN) Project -- The Chancellery has provided partial funding (along with other segmental offices) to the CAN project and has also assigned staff to represent the Chancellery in the CAN coordinating committee. The CAN project is designed to develop articulation agreements between two- and four-year colleges with a network guaranteeing reciprocity statewide. To date, 86 community colleges and 17 CSU campuses have indicated their intent to participate in CAN. The University of California campuses are still awaiting action by the faculty senates and the University President's Office before declaring their intent or extent of participation in CAN.

Recommendation 11: That the segments examine their policies and procedures to ensure that remedial coursework not granted baccalaureate degree credit by a four-year institution also not be identified as transfer credit by a two-year institution.

Recommendation 12: That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges take steps to ensure that the Community College districts examine their policies and procedures regarding the granting of associate degree credit to remedial courses.

In May 1985, the Board approved a uniform statewide definition of which courses comprise "remediation" and adopted Title 5 regulations which prohibit the award of associate degree-applicable credit for such courses. This has the effect, also, of prohibiting certification of such courses for transfer as well. The regulation language is currently under consideration by the Office of Administrative Law. It is expected that final approval by that Office can be achieved in time for the regulations to take effect in colleges in July 1987.

Recommendation 14: That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges develop a set of alternative models for assessment/placement which individual colleges can adapt to the needs of their students. (Also see Recommendation 7.)

During 1984-85, the Chancellery, in cooperation with the Learning Assessment Retention Consortia (LARC), conducted six regional workshops for colleges in which guidelines for developing evaluation models were presented. All colleges were encouraged to develop and pilot test evaluation models during that year and fully implement evaluation models in 1985-86. Five colleges were awarded sub-grants from CPEC's grant from FIPSE to pilot test their models. The report of a CPEC consultant on the usefulness of those funded models is expected shortly.

Recommendation 13: That the University of California, the California State University, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, and the State Board of Education examine by no later than January 15, 1984, the clientele, provision of services, and potential growth of English-As-A-Second Language services as a preliminary step in the development of a coherent philosophy and practical strategy to meet both current and future need.

In May 1985, the Board of Governors adopted a policy framework for English-As-A-Second Language (ESL) which directly responds to the intent in Recommendation 13. This framework addressed issues and proposed recommendations in several areas, including: a uniform definition for ESL; uniform statewide course classification; criteria for credit and noncredit ESL; uniform assessment and placement practices; establishment of course content equivalencies for beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESL, articulation and transferability of ESL with four-year colleges and Universities; and ESL instructor qualifications. In response to Board action, the Chancellor created a permanent advisory committee on ESL designed to work with staff in the implementation of those activities within the approved framework. The complete text of the ESL Board agenda item is included in Appendix A.

Recommendation 15: That all three segments, in the interest of improved articulation, explore with the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education the possibility of using appropriate postsecondary diagnostic tests so that high school students can be assured of consistent expectations between high schools and colleges and thus be encouraged to obtain the necessary skills before entering college.

As a result of a recommendation contained in the May 1985 Board item on remediation, staff assigned to represent the Chancellery at Roundtable on Educational Opportunity, have focused on the need to review all testing in the segments with an eye to improved coordination and elimination of unnecessary duplication. As a result, the Roundtable has initiated the State Department of Education to send representatives to discuss the "Golden State Examination" and "Comprehensive Assessment System." In addition, the Roundtable has assigned an intersegmental group to design a proposal to help coordinate these listing approaches.

The Math Diagnostic Testing Project is yet another area of Chancellery staff involvement. Chancellery staff has met on several occasions with representatives of the UC Math Diagnostic Testing Project to review current levels of community college participation and assist in increasing community college faculty involvement in the Project's work group. The Chancellery encouraged the University to continue support of the Project in order to develop a second mathematics test that would be useful in diagnosing skills deficiencies at and below the level of elementary algebra. Very recently, Chancellery staff has committed to increased involvement with the Project in promoting increased use of the tests by community colleges and in their articulation efforts with high schools.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Promises To Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities. Commission Report 83-2. Sacramento: The Commission, January 1983.*

--. *Progress Report on Segmental Responses to the Commission's Recommendations Regarding Remedial Education: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission.* Commission Report 84-26. Sacramento: The Commission, July 1984.

--. "Progress on Remedial Education in the Segments." Agenda Item 8, California Postsecondary Education Commission,December 15, 1985.

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. *The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges.* Sacramento: The Commission, March 1986.

Hunziker, Celeste M. *Evaluation of Remedial Programs at UC Davis.* Davis: Student Affairs Research and Information, University of California, Davis, March 1986.

University of California Work Group on Student Preparation and Remedial Education. *Report of the Work Group on Student Preparation and Remedial Education. Berkeley: Office of the Senior Vice President - Academic Affairs, University of California,* February 1986.

University of California Committee on Student Preparation. *The University and the Schools: Educational Excellence, A Joint Responsibility. A Report to the President from the Committee on Student Preparation, William R. Frazer, Chair.* Berkeley: University of California, September 1984.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of March 1987, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Roger C. Pettitt, Los Angeles
Sharon N. Skog, Mountain View, *Vice Chairperson*
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Mokelumne Hill

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

Arthur H. Margosian, Fresno; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Donald A. Henricksen, San Marino; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; representing the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Angie Papadakis, Palos Verdes; representing the California State Board of Education

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission issues some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE